

A STUDY OF THE CONCEPTION OF "LIFE"
IN THE SYNOPTIC TEACHING OF JESUS, AND ITS DEVELOPMENT
IN THE PAULINE AND JOHANNINE WRITINGS.

by

Buckley Stephens Rude.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Divinity
at Edinburgh University.
May 1938.



CONTENTS.

Preface	1
Chapter I - The Conception of Life in First Century Judaism	1
1. The Jewish Conception of the Origin and Meaning of Life	9
2. The Prophetic and Eschatological Influences on the Jewish Idea of Life	20
3. The Jewish Apocalyptic Literature	30
4. The Eschatology of Rabbinic Judaism	45
Chapter II - Jesus Proclaims Life	67
1. The Synoptic Occurrences of <u>Zoe</u>	68
2. Life in the Coming Kingdom	76
3. Synoptic Occurrences of <u>Psyche</u>	81
4. Did Jesus Teach an Interim Ethic?	89
5. Life as Equivalent to the Kingdom of God	100
6. Life in Communion	119
Chapter III - The Conception of Life in the Pauline Writings	132
1. <u>Zoe</u> as the Life after Death	142
2. Pauline Anthropology	156
3. Christ, the New Sphere of Life	166

4.	The Participation in Eternal Life by Faith . .	182
5.	Life through the Spirit	195
Chapter IV - The Johannine Interpretation of Life . .		205
1.	The Nature of Eternal Life	207
2.	The Relation between Synoptic and Johannine Life	231
3.	The Communication of Life	255
Conclusion		275
Bibliography		(1)

Abbreviations.

In most instances, the full titles of books are used in the manuscript. However, commentaries are sometimes indicated by their respective authors and the names of the books of the Bible which they explain. Abbreviations for the series to which commentaries belong are indicated in the bibliography.

Three instances of abbreviation for books are frequently used: for R.H.Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity - Eschatology; for H.L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar aus Talmud und Midrash - Strack-Billerbeck; and for Gerhard Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch aus Neuen Testament - Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T. Other abbreviations will be readily understood. Wherever a book is written by several authors, the author quoted is usually indicated rather than the authors.

'Ibid.' is sometimes used to refer to the first book in the previous footnote rather than the last as would be proper. An examination has shown, however, that these references are always clear although not strictly correct.

PREFACE.

Two years ago, because^{of} a critical problem which I was facing, I entered a seminar in which the life of Jesus according to the synoptic accounts was made the subject of a critical study. I was at that time in a somewhat skeptical frame of mind but was gratified to find that considerable freedom of thought was permitted the forty odd members of the seminar. From this study of the synoptic teaching of Jesus, there emerged an entirely new conception of life as Jesus was recorded to have taught it to his followers.

Being awakened to the possibilities of such a study where facilities would be available for scientific procedure in learning what was the basis for belief in the historical Jesus and what may have been his conception of the true life, I determined to go to Edinburgh for further study. The New College offered freedom from the restraints in study so cramping to the pursuit of post-graduate research in American universities. By rare good fortune, my advisers were men of generous sympathies as well as of scholarship, so that I was permitted to pursue my chosen line of study, but with the additional requirement of including the Pauline and Johannine writings in my field of research. The tremendous

scope of this study, which at first appeared so burdensome, has actually proved a blessing.

In accordance with scientific procedure, I sought to pursue the study with an open mind by using original sources where possible, and by arriving at independent conclusions with the help of the best available scholarship. Since the authorship of the writings would have required at least a separate volume for adequate consideration, the customary names were used for the authorship of the New Testament writings. References were made in the Pauline section to writings of uncertain authorship attributed to Paul: other passages in the New Testament were used, especially in the Acts, when they helped to bridge certain gaps in the development of the thesis.

In pursuing the critical aspect of the subject, the meanings of terms were purposely derived from their usage in the age primarily, rather than from their origins or derivations, because the former seemed to me of relatively greater importance. Streeter's solution of the synoptic problem, with certain modifications, was for the most part assumed, although the "form criticism" of the Gospels was recognized as a factor in the interpretation of the synoptic teaching of Jesus. This resulted in a somewhat complicated treatment of the teaching of Jesus in the effort to ascertain what lay nearest to his original teaching, and to show its

development within the synoptic tradition. My position has leaned toward skepticism with regard to the recovery of the actual words of Jesus, but toward confidence with regard to the general reliability of the Markan and Q materials (with certain modifications), as sources embodying the substance and intention of Jesus' teaching.

Certain difficulties have arisen as to the method of treatment of a subject of such proportions. There was the difficulty of organizing a selective bibliography. Only books which were consulted have been included in it. A few books which were consulted did not seem sufficiently relevant to include, while some related books may have been neglected as would be inevitable in a field of such magnitude. The most important opinions are nevertheless represented so far as they have been available to me.

Again there was the problem of developing the concept of life in such a fashion as to keep the different aspects bearing upon the whole and of proportioning the treatment of each part accordingly. Consequently, some instances of repetition in the treatment of the same material under different aspects will occur, although I sought to reduce it to the minimum. This will possibly be evident in the first chapter, in which there occurs not only a review of the important phases of Jewish life and thought in the New

Testament Age, but also the relationship of Jesus to them. It had seemed to me that the customary introduction, in which the review of the age remains virtually unrelated to the following discussion, sometimes proves a hindrance rather than a help to the understanding of that which follows. In this connection, the treatment of Jesus' paradox of losing the life in order to find it seemed to merit a fuller treatment in a specifically Jewish context and hence appears in this relationship in the first chapter.

Despite hours of labor in revision, the style is not all I should have desired. American spelling has been used because of the remote possibility that if the thesis should prove of sufficient merit, it may be submitted in a revised and more popular form to a certain American university which is offering an award for such a book to be submitted in 1940.

The sincere thanks due my supervisors, Professor Manson and Principal Curtis, has already been mentioned. Acknowledgement is also due Dr. Hunter, whose generous suggestions have aided the improvement of a heavy style, and Mr. Lindsay, the assistant librarian, without whose generous aid in making the books available as needed, much of the research could never have been completed. Others have also been generously helpful in aiding in corrections and the reading of proof. Special mention is due Mr. and Mrs. E.J. Sharp and the typists whose patience with difficult copy and special pains in

producing the best possible copy deserves unqualified praise.

This study of the conception of 'life' in the Synoptic, Pauline, and Johannine writings has disclosed that it is both an emergence in history and at the same time a constant, unchanged by historical considerations. It is the eschatological which is the constant factor, uniting the different phases of the historical development, and making them essentially one despite their differences. In the development of the thesis, the common essentials in the nature of this 'life' will appear as follows:

'Life' for the believer, in the thought of Jesus, Paul, and John, is that state of his being and activity in which he is inwardly cleansed, at peace, and dynamically loving toward God and his fellows through Christ by becoming wholly God's through absolute trust and obedience; so that he participates in and sheds abroad the immortal life of God in communion with fellow believers who are also of the Christ sphere of existence.

Finally, in all honesty I am compelled to say, that much to my surprise and contrary to all expectation, I discovered upon nearing the completion of the thesis that the basic elements in the quality of and conditions for the Christian life as revealed in my study are actually being realized in the Christian movement known as the Oxford Group movement, despite its seeming inconsistencies.

CHAPTER I.
THE CONCEPTION OF LIFE
IN FIRST CENTURY JUDAISM.

The religious conceptions of early Christianity can only be understood in the light of the political and social conditions in and about Palestine, in the few centuries preceding, and in the century following, the birth of Jesus. This is perhaps more easily perceived if we turn to a parallel from modern Europe.

No one will doubt the effect of political and social conditions in changing the religious thinking of a generation, who will trouble to follow the progress of German theology in the last fifty years. With Germany at the height of her power, the liberal views of Schliermacher and Harnack held sway. Man was said to discover the Kingdom of God as he discovered and entered into a moral relation to God - discovered God as father, and himself as son.¹ Harnack dissociates John the Baptist's teaching from that of Jesus, because of the contrast between the moral character of Jesus' teaching, and the current eschatology which characterized John's. This liberal movement was characterized by an optimism concerning the moral possibilities of man. Since the moral, not the eschatological, was really

1. A. Harnack, What is Christianity, pp. 16, 55 ff., 135.

characteristic of Jesus' teaching,¹ man should look to the kingdom of God within.² The views of Schweitzer, Wrede, and Kirkegaard were scarcely heeded, and then only in special and very academic circles.

Then came the World War, and the voices of Brunner, Gogarten, and Barth were heard in theology, thundering the transcendent sovereignty and majesty of God over against man's inadequacy. The "dialectic" of Kirkegaard was revived.³ Bultmann and Dibelius, following somewhat the line of Schweitzer, directed their weapon of form criticism ("Formgeschichte") against the liberal view of Jesus; and out of the debris came a few scattered sayings of a teacher and prophet who lived in constant expectation of the "eschaton".⁴ Again, from this angle, religious thinking has been directed into the dialectic mould. The popularity of this dialectic mood, and the reason for it, will only be adequately realized by one who has lived among the German people in the desperate situation with which they were

1. Ibid., p. 55.

2. Cf. A.C. McGiffert, "The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas," (1915), p. 287.

3. K. Barth, "The Epistle to the Romans," p. 252.

4. Cf. R. Bultmann, "Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition," p. 160, 161, where he suggests that the original scene of the Last Supper was a joyous occasion, expectant of the coming kingdom.

faced after the World War, when any hope for man to lift himself from his social, economic, and political morass had long since been crushed. This sense of despair was likewise accompanied by a sense of human inadequacy and guilt. God must intervene if anything were to be done for man. In place of life in this world, life in the eternal world was proclaimed to be the centrum of existence.

The situation in Palestine preceding the Christian era and at the beginning of it was, in many respects, parallel to this. As Legge says, "To this nation, Yaweh had, according to their own traditions, promised exclusive temporal advantages; but in spite of this promise they had become in turn the slaves or tributaries of the Egyptians, the Philistines, the Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians..."¹ Nor was the lot of the Jews greatly improved when they returned to Palestine. They had to suffer repeatedly the desecration of the temple at the hands of the heathen, beginning with that awful day in December 168 B.C. when a sacrifice was offered upon a pagan altar in the temple at Jerusalem by order of Antiochus Epiphanes.² Again, in 63 B.C., Pompey conquered Jerusalem, putting 12,000 Jews to

1. F. Legge, "Forerunners and Rivals of Early Christianity," Vol. I, p. 150.

2. I Macc. 1:54; E. Schürer, "A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ," Div. I, Vol. I, p. 208.

the sword, and forcing his way into the Most Holy Place, into which only the feet of the high priest had ever before entered.¹

To be sure, Judea was raised by the Maccabees from an obscure state to one of the most significant in its region, between these two desecrations of the temple. Its borders were extended as far north as the northern borders of Galilee, while its southern borders included part of Idumea.² But the hope held out by their priestly rulers was short lived, when Rome came into power and Pompey conquered all before him.

With Herod the Great in power, the condition of the country seemed outwardly prosperous and fairly peaceful with the building of the temple; but, if we may rely on Josephus, an earthquake and disease took away the greater part of the population, while drought, disease and famine stalked the land.³ However, the period was not without its uprisings, for which Galilee seems to have been a breeding place, at least in the case of Hezekiah and his son, Judas, both of whom were put to death, the latter with two thousand of his followers who were crucified. A certain Simon, a slave of Herod, headed another band until

1. Ibid., p. 321-22

2. J.Klausner, "Jesus of Nazareth," p. 136.

3. "Antiquities of the Jews," Bk. 15, Ch. V: 2, 3, IX:1.

he was killed; and another, Athronges, formerly a shepherd, assumed a royal crown and kept the country in ferment.¹ Such uprisings were occurring at the death of Herod, about 4 B.C., soon after the birth of Jesus.

These uprisings were not without their religious significance. Although Schürer inclines to make them out as excursions by bands of pillagers,² we have evidence that, from the Jewish point of view these uprisings were of a vastly different character from such pillagings. The stirring episode in the negro religious drama, "The Green Pastures," in which Hezekiah, leader of such a band defies his enemies with his dwindling group of followers, confident that God will vindicate His cause and His people, is a far more accurate description of the motives which prompted these uprisings. Josephus significantly classes the followers of Judas the Galilean as a religious party. He further declares:

"These men agree in all things with the Pharisaic notions; but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty and say that God is their only ruler and Lord. They also do not value dying any kinds of death, nor indeed do they heed the deaths of their relations and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man lord."³

1. E.Schürer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ," Div. I, Vol. II, pp. 4, 5.

2. Ibid., Div. I, Vol. II, pp. 80, 81.

3. "Antiquities," Book XVIII, Ch. I:6 (Trans. by W.Whiston, The Works of Flavius Josephus.)

Since, as Josephus says, their doctrine included certain tenets held by the Pharisees, we may infer that the resurrection hope of the Pharisees may possibly have played a large part in the courageous confidence of these Galileans, that if God did not vindicate them now, He would hereafter.

In his description of the Essenes, Josephus shows explicitly how their confidence in God's vindication by His granting them immortality after death, gave them courage to endure their persecutions. Of them he says:

"They make light of danger and triumph over pain by their resolute will; death if it come with honour, they consider better than immortality. The war with the Romans (63 B.C.) tried their souls (*ψυχάς*) through and through by every variety of test. Racked and twisted, burnt and broken, and made to pass through every instrument of torture in order to induce them to blaspheme their lawgiver or to eat some forbidden thing, they refused to yield to either demand, nor ever once did they cringe to their persecutors or shed a tear. Smiling in their agonies and mildly deriding their tormentors, they cheerfully resigned their souls, confident that they would receive them back again." ¹

A similar fanatic zeal inspired a group of young Jews to cut down a golden eagle, erected over the great gate of the temple (5 to 4 B.C.). When brought before Herod, he said, "And why so exultant when you will shortly be put to death?" To this they replied with confident conviction, "Because after our death we shall enjoy greater felicity." ²

1. "Jewish Wars," Bk. II, Ch. VIII: 10, 11 (Loeb Classics, trans. by H.St.J.Thackeray, 1927).

2. Ibid., Bk. I, Ch. XXXIII: 2, 3.

While due allowance must be made for Josephus' pride in his race, we can at least ascertain what in the religious beliefs of the day helped the people to endure persecution, and inspired some of them with fanatic zeal to throw off the foreign yoke. To these few, Israel's defeat meant God's defeat; and Israel's deliverance and glory, God's manifestation of power.¹

Because of repeated defeats in these efforts to throw off the Roman yoke, many came to fasten their hopes on some form of divine intervention, possibly of a Messianic reign, by which God would vindicate Himself. As Schürer says:

"The numerous popular tumults of a politico-religious kind which took place in the time of the Roman procurators (A.D. 44-66), give sufficient evidence of the feverish tension, with which a miraculous intervention of God in history and the appearance of His kingdom on earth were expected. How else could men such as Theudas the Egyptian have found believers for their promises by hundreds and thousands? Even Josephus super-abundantly confesses, that the Messianic hope was one of the most powerful levers in the great insurrection against Rome."²

1. Luke 1:68-75, 2:29-32. That similar uprisings were feared during the ministry of Jesus is indicated in the report brought to Jesus of the Galileans whose blood Pilate mixed with their sacrifices. (Luke 13:1).

2. E. Schürer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ," Div. II, Vol. II, p. 149. Cf. Conrad Noel, "The Life of Jesus," p. 172. This provoking work has rightly made note of the political conditions in Palestine as influencing the eschatology, but indicates a lack of critical knowledge of eschatological writings and thought of the age as shown by some of the sweeping and inaccurate generalizations. For instance, he treats R.H. Charles' work in eschatology as if it were a matter of personal opinion rather than critical investigation: p. 174.

The effect of the political and social conditions in Palestine on the theological thinking of this period is recognized by Kohler, especially as related to life after death. He shows how this new emphasis comes to the fore as follows:

"In the course of time, however, the question of the existence after death demanded more and more a satisfactory answer. Under the severe political and social oppression that came upon the Jewish people, the pious ones failed to see a just equation of man's doings and his destiny in this life. The bitter disappointment which they experienced made them look to the God of justice for a future, when virtue would receive its reward and vice its befitting punishment. The community of the pious especially awaited in vain the realization of the great messianic hope with which the prophetic words of comfort had filled their hearts So the voice of promise (of life beyond the grave) came to them from the book of Isaiah Hence the minds of the Jewish people were sufficiently prepared to adopt the Persian belief in the resurrection of the dead." 1.

1. K.Kohler, "Jewish Theology, Systematically and Historically Considered," pp. 282-3. Reference is to Isaiah 26:19 which he significantly translates with "thy dead". Cf. also I Sam. 2:6.

THE JEWISH CONCEPTION OF THE ORIGIN AND MEANING
OF LIFE.

Thus it was to the conception of "life" (חַיִּים) ¹ in the Old Testament that the pious Jew began to look for hope and consolation.

Originally the conception of life among the Hebrews pertained to man's physical existence, though it represented to the Hebrews far more than an observable biological phenomenon. He had always looked upon life as man's highest possession since it was presupposed as the basis of all other possessions and was therefore valued above any of them, (Proverbs 3:16, Job 2:4). Life is indeed sometimes used equivalent to happiness or prosperity, (I Sam. 18:18, Prov. 14:27, 16:15, 19:23, 21:21); and longevity is constantly prized as the highest good fortune, (Gen. 25:8, 35:29, Job 42:17). With life, therefore, was associated the chief good that a man could possess, so that quite

1. The term (נֶפֶשׁ) is often used in an almost equivalent sense. It is often translated soul and has reference to the seat of the appetites, Deut. 12:21, 14:26, to the self, Deut. 4:9, Isa. 43:4. It is the physical life principle contained in the blood, Gen. 9:4, Deut. 12:23, while חַיִּים is the life force, Gen. 2:7. רוּחַ (spirit or wind) has chiefly to do with the emotions which were thought to be controlled by God. I Sam. 18:10, 16:14, I Sam. 10:10, Josh. 5:1, Prov. 16:18, 32. The idea of spirit is also associated with life (נֶפֶשׁ) Isa. 57:16 and finally after 200 B.C. these two concepts become identical in essence and function. Cf. R.H. Charles, "Eschatology," p. 195, R. Bultmann, "Theologisches Wörterbuch z. N. T., Band II, Lieferung 14, p. 851 f. רוּחַ or חַיִּים is treated here because of its correspondence to ψυχή and ζωή in 140 out of 147 occurrences in the LXX. Cf. G. Bertram, "Theologisches Wörterbuch z. N. T.," Band II, Lief. 14, p. 853. Cf. F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C.A. Briggs, "A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament."

naturally the story of the Garden of Eden and man's loss of the fruit of the Tree of Life played a part of exceptional importance in later Jewish thought.¹

Later Palestinian Judaism retained this emphasis on the high value of life as the chief good. It is compared to wine (Sirach 31:27²), to health and gladness (Tobit 8:17), and length of days (Tobit 12:9, Baruch 3:14). It is repeatedly equivalent to health and salvation (Dan. 2:4, 3:9, 6:20 ff., Sirach 30:14: ff, 34:13-17, Judith 7:27, 11:3). Thus the old Hebrew idea of the importance of Life is retained almost intact.

On the other hand, death appears to be dreaded in the later Jewish as well as in the old Hebrew conception.³ While death may be better than a miserable life (Sirach 30:17, 40:28), even death by suicide (Tobit 3:6-15), yet with death, all hope and everything worth living for are gone (Sirach 10:11). From the grave none shall praise God (Sirach 17:27).⁴

1. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. IV, Part 2, p. 1145. While some quotations given from the Rabbis are as late as 300 A.D., yet these generally reflect an earlier tradition except as regards a later theological bias. S.Schechter "Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology," p. 2.

2. Greek version 31:20.

3. Cf. J.Baillie, "And the Life Everlasting," pp. 86 ff. and R.H.Charles, "Eschatology," pp. 31 ff.

4. R.Bultmann, "Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T.," Band II, Lief. 14, p.857.

The Jew saw that the hope for a full and complete life lay solely in the hands of God, for the origin of man's life was accounted for as the creative act of God, (Gen. 1:27). Therefore, life comes purely from God, and is sustained by Him alone. Life apart from God would have exceeded the imagination of the Hebrew. God as the author of all things must of necessity be the author of life (Gen. 1). He is the source of all life (Psalms 36:9, 139:13 ff). He alone is the Lord of life and death (Num. 27:16, Job 12:10, Deut. 32:39). He has the book of destiny which determines the span of man's life, according as man is favoured by God because of his righteousness (Exodus 32:32 ff., Mal. 3:16 ff., Psalms 69:28 ff.), for death is separation from God (Isa. 38:11, Psalms 115:17). Life is a gift placed alongside the wisdom and riches which God bestows on Solomon (I Kings 3:5-15). This idea that life is dependent solely and completely on God is so essential to the Jewish conception of it, that it may be said to be the key to the Jewish interpretation of it.¹ For the

1. Cf. G. von Rad, and R. Bultmann, in "Theologisches Wörterbuch z. N. T.," Band II, Lieferung 13, 14, p.845 ff. and p. 852 ff. The representation here is by no means too strong. The modern secular view of life would have seemed blasphemous to the Jew, or more likely - totally incomprehensible. After visiting Palestine and reading the Old Testament I sensed more vividly the feelings of the Hebrew who saw God's will and work in every circumstance of life, and his own destiny in God's hands.

Hebrew idea of God's complete lordship over life and death is also retained in the late Palestinian Jewish writings of the last two centuries before the birth of Jesus. (Sirach 11:14, Wisdom of Solomon 16:13). God is addressed, "O Lord, Father and Master of my life" (Sirach 23:1, cf. 23:4), for He is the giver of life to man (II Macc. 7:22 f., 14:46), and it is He who put the spirit of life into man (Judith 16:14, cf. Gen. 2:7).

The direct counterpart of God's lordship is man's obedience, so that man's destiny is the direct result of the measure in which he keeps the commandments of God. This was not at first applied to the individual, for like most primitive peoples, the individual among the Hebrews was merged in the nation. The prophetic religion implanted a hope of blessed immortality, not for the individual, but for the nation.¹ For this reason, the covenant which God makes with Israel is a national covenant. The agreement consists in this: that if Israel keeps this law which Yahweh, their God, has demanded as His requirement of them, Yahweh will in return preserve their life and make them prosperous and great as a nation by protecting them from their enemies; but if they refuse to keep this commandment,

1. R.H.Charles, "Eschatology," pp. 82 ff., p. 130.
 J.Baillie, "And the Life Everlasting," pp. 145 ff.
 The exceptions to this are Dan. 12:23 and Isa.26:1-19, where the resurrection of the righteous occurs. Jeremiah and Ezekiel begin also to change.

which is to reject Yahweh as their God, they shall be left to destruction, (Deut. 30:15-20, also Ch. 8, cf. Amos 8:11 ff.).¹ The commandment of God is the very bread of life, yea, even more important than physical bread (Deut. 8:3, 32:47). 'Faith' in the Old Testament is therefore the absolute trust exhibited in faithfulness to the saving God who gives life to those who keep His commandments, (Hab. 2:4, Amos 5:4,14, Jer. 38:20).² Faith without obedience would have been contradictory to the Hebrew, for man's attitude toward God was inseparably linked with his will.³ And it was for the training of his will that man studied the commandments (Prov. 10:17, 23:13,14) and the Torah in order to get wisdom which led to life, (Prov. 2:19, 5:6, 6:23, 10:17, 15:24). Far from being simply speculative knowledge, wisdom was knowledge in moral behaviour, training in the way of life (Prov. 4:13, 6:23).⁴ Therefore

1. Cf. however, A.B. Davidson, "The Theology of the Old Testament," p.240, who qualifies this by saying "Even when Israel sinned, He was restrained by His covenant from destroying Israel, even from chastising Israel beyond measure." But Davidson admits, "No doubt, when Israel failed to fulfil the conditions of the covenant, it might be said to cease."

2. G. von Rad, "Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T.", p. 847.

3. G.F. Moore, "Judaism," Vol. II, pp. 237, 238.

4. Cf. John 7:17.

wisdom is the fountain of life (Prov. 13:14, 16:22), but the way of foolishness leads to death (Prov. 3:18, 8:35).¹

Late Palestinian Judaism followed the Old Testament in hinging life on the commandment of God, for the commandment of God was the commandment of life (Baruch 3:9, 4:1) and His Word was the Word of life (IV Ezra 7:21).² The Torah is therefore variously referred to by the Rabbis as the "tree of Life",³ or as the "medicine of Life",⁴ which is open for man to choose.⁵ On the other hand death is to be feared (Sirach 28:6) especially as punishment for sin.⁶ Death came into the world through Eve by her disobedience in the Garden of Eden, and in consequence of this entrance of sin into the world, all men are sinners and worthy of death (Sirach 25:24, IV Ezra 7:46, 68).⁷ This does not

1. Cf. G. von Rad, Op. cit., p. 847.

2. Or II Esdras; cf. Strack-Billerbeck, Band I, p.464. "This is the way concerning which Moses spoke to the people: Choose life for thyself that thou mayest have life." II Es. 7:129.

3. Ibid., Band II, p. 483.

4. Ibid., Band III, p. 498.

5. Sirach 5:17, 37:18.
N.B. "Sirach" is used for Ecclesiasticus.

6. Strack-Billerbeck, Band I, pp. 878, 815, and Band III, pp. 155-57. Cf. W. Bousset, "Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter", p.327.

7. Ibid., Band I, p. 137.

imply that man is not responsible, rather that he has become subject to sin.

Thus, in this brief summary of the Old Testament and later Palestinian Jewish conception of 'life' and 'death', it becomes evident how intimately life is bound to 'righteousness', or that right relationship which exists between God and the man who obeys His Torah.¹ In the light of this, we can understand the reason for the infinite pains of the Rabbis to rightly interpret the Law so that it might be properly obeyed by the Jew; and furthermore the reason for the rise of the tradition, that Moses, along with the written law, gave the oral tradition.² The issues of life were centered in the interpretation of the Law, the Jewish norm of righteousness. It is quite natural that righteousness would be identified with certain acts of conformity to this Torah.³

The interpretation of righteousness consequently becomes for Jesus one of the chief issues of His ministry, because on this hinged man's hope for eternal life.⁴ That

1. A.B. Davidson, "The Theology of the Old Testament," p. 440.

2. A. Edersheim, "The Life and Times of Jesus, the Messiah," cf. p. 99., Vol. I, also pp. 107, 108.

3. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. IV. Part I, p. 14.

4. Matt. 19: 16-29, Mark 10: 17-30, Luke 18: 18-30, cf. 10: 25-28.

the attainment of eternal life should be hoped for in the keeping of the Torah, was already presupposed in the Rabbinic teaching of the time. "Wie die Tora der ganzen Welt das Leben gegeben hat, so bedeutet sie ganz insonderheit das Leben für Israel"¹ "Auch Jesus hat die alte Tora nicht aufgelöst, im Gegenteil: indem er durch Erschliessung ihres vollen sittlichen Gehalts ihre höchste u. vollkommenste Erfüllung ermöglichte, hat er sie vielmehr bestätigt u. bekräftigt."²

However, the conception of eternal life which Jesus seems to take for granted as already known to his hearers, is indeed one quite unfamiliar to the Old Testament.³ Since Jesus deals with the individual in relation to it, and since, as we have indicated above, the hope of the Israelite for the future was largely national among the Old Testament writers, we may expect to find a process of individualization in the Jewish hope for the future.

The Old Hebrew hope for life beyond the grave was centered in the nation, because the only form in which

1. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. IV, Part I, p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 1.

3. Cf. A.H. McNeille's discussion of אֱלֵיָּהּ; The Gospel according to Matthew, p. 263.

the personality of the Hebrew was known to persist was in his posterity.¹ Death meant going to the grave, sleeping with one's fathers, so that the most that one might hope for, was a long life with a peaceful death and proper burial with ones ancestors.² A life whose possibilities were cut off was no longer life, so that sickness might be equivalent to death. (Job 33: 19-30).³ The story of God's promise of a posterity to Abraham in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis pictures most vividly how the hope of the Hebrew for the future was centered in the persistence of his identity in his posterity.

Significant indeed is the identification of Abraham, himself, with his posterity in his inheritance. For Abraham says: "O Lord Yahweh, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless" And he said unto him, "I am Yahweh that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees to give thee this land to inherit it." And he said, "O Lord Yahweh, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit

1. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, "They still believed that the soul subsisted after death, though it did not exist." P. 43.

2. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 31 ff. Cf. Gen. 15:15.

3. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., p. 852.

it?" (Gen. 15: 7,8).¹ The question of how this portion of Genesis came to be written and whether this actually represents Abraham's point of view is unimportant. The point of the issue is that whoever wrote the account made this identification.

It is of interest that later in Hebrew history, the reverse process took place, and the hope of this very posterity rested upon its identification with Abraham wherein its national hope lay. This reverse identification becomes of particular interest in connection with Jesus' argument in favor of a resurrection of the dead, from the words, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Here, however, the argument is not for the survival of the nation, but for the resurrection of the individual. (Mark 12: 26,27).

The important aspect which Jesus stresses is that the hope of Abraham for a posterity lay solely with God. God was the connecting link between Abraham and his posterity, so that Abraham's future lay solely in the hands of

1. A.B. Davidson, in The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 440 says, "What the patriarchs are represented as looking forward to was not the rest of Canaan, but abiding with God, - a settled nearness to Him and fellowship with Him. They sought 'a country' - which the New Testament writer, from his point of view, interprets as a heavenly one (Heb. 11:16)." The evidence just adduced seems to contradict this. Only in the exceptional cases of Enoch and Elijah does this fellowship with God after death seem to exist. On the other hand, Davidson's statement that "Life lay in God's favour, in His presence and fellowship," is quite a true representation of the Hebrew's idea of man's mortal life. Nearer to the correct view is his observation that "the individual had his immortality in that of the theocracy In his children he continued to live." Ibid., P. 407.

God. The writer of this account had perceived in Abraham a new quality of righteousness. And, with a flash of inspiration which centuries later kindled the heart of the apostle Paul¹ he comments, "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." But Abraham's posterity, in looking back to him, fell into the error of setting its hope in the physical connection with the patriarch, rather than in God as Abraham himself had done before them. The recall of Israel to God by John the Baptist and Jesus thus became, from one point of view, a recall of Israel from the Patriarchs and the traditions which held them in the grips of the past, to trust in the living God whose rule and kingdom were at hand.²

1. Rom. 4: 3,9,22, Gal. 3: 6-11. In this latter passage, Paul interprets the faith of Abraham by the words of Habakkuk 2: 4: "The righteousness shall live by his faith." These words, viewed in their context, center man's hope of righteousness and life in reliance on God rather than self-reliance. Paul has therefore rightly interpreted their meaning in using Hab. 2: 4 to interpret Abraham's faith.

2. Cf. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word p. 46. Matt. 3: 9, Luke 3: 8, Jno. 8: 33, 39, cf. Matt. 15: 3, Lk. 4: 23 ff.

THE PROPHEPIC AND ESCHATOLOGICAL INFLUENCES ON THE
JEWISH IDEA OF LIFE.

From this primitive view, with its flashes of New Testament insight, we turn to the prophetic and Messianic hope for the future with their bearing on life after death. The previous discussion has shown that the patriarchal hope of survival in posterity had become for the individual Israelite the hope of survival in the future of the nation. When the prophets recalled the people to the covenant, they were speaking to Israel as a nation, for the covenant had been made with the people as a whole, and not with individuals. Its benefits accrued to individuals only as they were members of the nation. In the covenant Yahweh had set before the people "life and good, and death and evil"¹ according as they chose to obey His commandments or to violate them. Israel, as the prophets came to see her, chose the way of death through idolatry and disobedience.² Apparently nothing could stay the sentence of dissolution, though the cry of the prophet rang out for the nation to return to Yahweh

1. Deut. 30: 15.

2. Hosea 13: 1.

and live.¹ But hope for the whole of Israel faded and was replaced by the hope for a remnant.² Thus, the figure of a resurrection is used for the revival of Israel by Hosea: "Let us return unto the Lord. After two days He will revive us: and the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight" (6:2).³

This sense of national solidarity⁴ is especially important in realizing the significant relationship between the hope for the Messianic Kingdom and the hope of survival after death. Every individual Israelite was dependent on every other Israelite in realizing this solidarity by complete obedience to God. His hopes, his labors, and his posterity were a part of this larger unit over which God was ruler. "He saw the good of Israel, and he continued to live in the fuller life of his people."⁵ There is, in fact, a Rabbinic saying, that if all Israel

1. Isaiah 1: 18-20.

2. Amos 5: 14, 15 - reference is specifically to Judah. Jer. 23: 3.

3. A.B. Davidson, "The Theology of the Old Testament," p. 449.

4. Cf. S. Schechter, "Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology," pp. 104 ff. The Kingdom was originally the hope of a time of material bliss in the national life of Israel when justice would prevail.

5. A.B. Davidson, "Theology of the Old Testament," p.407.

would keep the Sabbath but one day, the Messianic age would come.¹ This emphasis on social solidarity also appears in a new sense in Jesus' teaching. The error is often made to set forth the teaching of Jesus on the value of the individual as his sanction of unqualified individualism, as if Jesus supposed that each man's life was an entity by itself. Nothing is further from the thought of Jesus. If anything, the emphasis on solidarity was greater with Jesus than with the Rabbis, since he used terms from the more intimate relationships of the family to describe the relationship of his disciples to him and to one another. This relationship, however, he held to be more intimate even than that of blood (Mark 3: 31-35 and parallels).

Certainly the total loss of self implied in the words, - "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it" (Matt. 10- 39 and parallels) - implies a solidarity through a merging of the individual in the cause of Jesus even greater than is required of the Israelite in merging himself in the theocratic state. For Jesus set this loyalty above the most sacred ties in the theocratic state when he says, "If any ~~man~~ cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life

1. Simeon ben Yoka said, "Should Israel keep two Sabbaths according to rule, ----- forthwith they should be delivered." Ben Levi said, "If Israel would keep only a single Sabbath as it is prescribed, at once the Messiah would come." G.F. Moore, "Judaism", Vol. II, p. 350.

also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14: 26). This loss of one's life means in Jesus' teaching, however, to have it re-created and to have it raised up again. It is the re-creation of the individual by his merging into the will of God with which Jesus is concerned, rather than the preservation of the individuality as such. Thus, the solidarity of the national hope of the Jews was transferred by Jesus to the conception of a Kingdom of God in which true unity in God's will must prevail. Through this unity in God's will, the individual's hope for immortality was still regarded as a relation to the new community.¹

As for individual immortality, the hope for it is comparatively scant in the Old Testament. Exceptional instances did occur like Elijah's translation or that of Enoch who "walked with God and he was not for God took him."² In all probability, these instances laid hold on the Hebrew imagination, just because they were exceptional.³

This strong feeling that God would somehow vindicate His righteous is responsible for the most of those passages

1. Cf. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 47.
"Not the individual but the Church is called -----."

2. Cf. Gen. 5: 24, II Kings 3: 11.

3. Cf. A. B. Davidson, Op. cit., p. 442 on Psalm 73: 24. He is, however, opposed by O.S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature, pp. 158 ff.

in the Old Testament which seem to indicate that although the wicked prosper while the righteous suffer in the present order, the future will bring destruction to the wicked and honor and vindication to the righteous. Job 19: 25-27 is the most striking of these passages:

"But I know that my redeemer(vindicator - Goel) liveth,
And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth:
And after my skin has been thus destroyed,
Yet from my flesh shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And my eyes shall see and not another,
My reins are consumed within me."¹

This yearning for the vindication of the righteous individual is most frequently expressed in the Psalms. Surely God will not let his holy one see corruption, who has received instruction at the hand of God and walked in fellowship with him. Surely God will show him the path of life (Ps. 16: 10, 11). The first desire of the Psalmist is that he may behold the face of God, and not

1. O.S. Rankin again protests against taking this to refer to the survival of the soul after death. He gives the views of König, Duhm, and G.F. Moore which suggest the survival of a disincarnate spirit. He sees the conflict between this and such parts of Job as 17: 14 ff. "Could this insight - appearing in the early part of the book of Job - have nothing to do with the solution of the book? Could it be a psychological state demanding an answer?" The author of the book of Job was under no such stress or tension. - Israel's Wisdom Literature, pp. 148 ff., esp. p. 150.

simply that he may satisfy his physical needs, (Ps. 17: 14, 15; Ps. 73: 25). For this reason he may expect deliverance from the wicked (17: 13). It is God alone who is vindicator (Ps. 49:15) though there are times when the Psalmist is concerned over His delay in vindicating His servant (Ps. 73: 13, 14).

While it is true that in scarcely any of these instances can the survival of the individual after death be proved beyond the shadow of a doubt to have been in the writer's mind, yet it is significant that most of these passages are used by the late Jewish Rabbis to refer to life in the future world or Gan Eden.¹ Whatever be the interpretation of life after death intended by the writers of these passages, there is no doubt as to the meaning assigned to them in the early centuries of the Christian era. The conviction of God's vindication of His righteous, when it was seen that His vindication could not conform to this present life, triumphed through the hope of God's ultimate justice in a life beyond the

1. Strack-Billerback. For Ps. 16: 10, see the Rabbinic interpretation in Vol. IV, Part II. p. 836; for Ps. 17: 15, see Ibid., p. 924; for Ps. 49: 9, 10, see Ibid., p. 1039; and for Ps. 90: 14, see Ibid., p. 855. In each of these instances reference is made to life after death.

grave.¹

Perhaps of even greater significance is the evidence which the Septuagint offers of this tendency. While it was not of Palestinian origin, but probably written by some Alexandrian Jews who finally completed the translation about 100 B.C. at the latest, it was not necessarily without influence from, or influence on Palestinian Judaism.² This is not to say that Alexandrian Greek influence did not play its part in influencing the translators. Greek influence may be traced in the connection of 'light' with 'life.' For instance, in Psalms 56:13 (Heb. 55: 14) the phrase - "To walk before God in the light of the living לְפָנֵי יְהוָה בְּאוֹר חַיִּים" - is translated in the Septuagint, -

1. Montefiore says that the difference between Judaism A.D. 50 and A.D. 350 is that in the latter, there was no belief in a bliss beyond the grave. As he says, "In A.D. 50 he (the Jew) believed that, for the righteous at any rate the higher happiness would actually not be experienced till beyond the grave." The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. by Foakes-Jackson and Lake, Vol. I, p. 36.

2. Acts 2: 5 ff.; cf. R.R. Ottley, "A Handbook to the Septuagint" p. 35 who says, "Now the best authorities perceive no clear signs of Palestinian influence in the translation generally." H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p. 20, says, "The Greek of the Alexandrian Pentateuch is Egyptian, and as far as we can judge, not such as Palestinian translators would have written." This does not necessarily mean that Palestinian influence may not have influenced the translations at one time or another. Alfred Edersheim, who is no mean scholar of the Septuagint says, "Distinct Jewish elements are undeniably there, which can only be explained by reference to Jewish tradition, although they are much fewer than some critics have supposed." The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah Vol. I, p. 27.

"to walk before God through the light of life (διὰ φωτὸς τῆς ζωῆς)" - so that the "light of life" must appear as a gift of grace which is possible to those who walk before God. On the other hand the Septuagint interpretation of Isaiah 53:8 hardly admits of Greek influence and definitely carries the Hebrew idea of being 'taken' to be with God contained in the Enoch story.¹ The passage which speaks of the suffering servant tells in the Masoretic text of him being "cut off from the land of the living" (קָטָע מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים) while the Septuagint version says that "his life is taken from the earth," (αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ).² Similarly Psalm 16: 9 (Heb. 15:9) shows traces of an eschatological influence in the Septuagint translation. The passage as rendered in the American Standard Bible reads as follows:

"My flesh also shall dwell in safety.
For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol;
Neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to
see corruption.
Thou wilt show me the path of life:
In thy presence is fulness of joy;
In thy right hand there are pleasures
for evermore."³

1. Cf. also Prov. 9: 6a where "and ye shall live" (וַיְחַיֵּי), is translated "in order that ye may reign into eternity" (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα βασιλεύσατε). This is too obviously Jewish-eschatological to be denied. Cf. J. Bertram, "Theologisches Wörterbuch z. N.T.", Band II, Lief. 14, p. 855 f.

2. Cf. Acts 8: 33.

3. Ps. 16: 9b, 10, 11.

For the Hebrew rendering - "My flesh also shall dwell in safety (לִבִּי בְּאֲמוּנָה)," - the Septuagint renders the same passage - "But yet my flesh also shall dwell in hope (ἐν ἐλπίδι),"-thus projecting into the future what follows so as to relate it to life after death.¹

These passages must have had a large part in moulding the message of the early church into a proclamation of the suffering servant Jesus, as the risen Messiah. For, the propagation of the gospel outside of Palestine was carried on with the use of the Septuagint, and even in the Synoptic Gospels, the Old Testament quotations are largely from the Septuagint.²

However, it was chiefly in the second and first century B.C. and the first century A.D. that the developed form of the resurrection doctrine came to the fore. There seems to have been a mixture of Chaldean Astrology³ and Persian dualism and angelology in certain apocalyptic writings of this period. The strong dualistic trend of the

1. Cf. Acts 2: 26-28.

2. Cf. H.B. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, pp. 381-405; and R.R. Ottley, A Handbook to the Septuagint, p. 36.

3. Cf. F. Cumont, After Life in Roman Paganism, p. 108, "Judaism had already made concessions to the astronomical theories of the Chaldeans"

Persians in which the world of light is wrestling with the world of darkness and its demons is likewise to be found in these apocalyptic writings.¹ The striking likeness of the Zoroastrian eschatology to this late Jewish eschatology cannot be denied.²

On the Jewish side, apocalypticism arose from a desire to give some assurance in a time of political and social stress, that the prophecies of the past which told of a better time³ would be fulfilled. The astrological determinism of the Chaldeans was used to assure the doubting that God had ordained the end from the beginning, particularly the times of the Messianic Age.⁴ This apocalypticism is credibly believed by some scholars to have first arisen in Galilee where it must have significantly influenced the thinking of certain circles in which Jesus' himself moved.⁵ Authorities differ as to whether the writings arose among the Essenes or the Chasids, predecessors of the Pharisees.⁶ When it is remembered that

1. Cf. I Enoch 83-90: Testaments of the Twelve, Reuben 6: 11, 12; Levi 18: 12; Dan. 5: 10. Also Ezek. 38, 39. Cf. The Gathas, Yashna 30: 5-8.

2. Cf. E.C. Dewick, "Primitive Christian Eschatology", p. 405, 406.

3. Isa. 65: 17 ff. Jer. 24:4 ff. Ezek. 39: 25 ff. Joel 3:1 ff. Amos 9. Zepheniah 3: 14 ff. Haggai 2: 23. Zech. 14, Mal. 4.

4. Dan. 9: 25-27. I. Enoch 83-90. Ibid., 91-104.

5. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 193; cf. also R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 142.

6. F. Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, p. 159, attributes the writings to the Essenes. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 170 attributes them to the Chasids.

Galilee was the source of many uprisings, though it had been a Jewish province only since the rise of the Maccabees, it may be easily seen how the Persian eschatology from the north may have reinforced the Jewish hope in producing the Jewish apocalyptic literature.¹

THE JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

Certain features of the theology of this literature deserve to be considered because of the background which they disclose for the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. In order to be specific, we shall review these pertinent doctrines in their contexts, and then draw conclusions from a closer analysis of them at the close of the review.

The rise of this literature was due to an effort by a circle of Jews to justify God's ways with their nation in a time of distress. At the first half of the second century before Christ, the Book of Daniel brought

1. R. Otto in his Reich Gottes und Menschensohn has presented the evidence more in detail showing how Judaism was in truth only about a century in Galilee and that under Syrian rule the Zoroastrian and Iranian influence must have prevailed. Apart from this, Persian and Babylonian influences are likely to have been influential during the Babylonian and Persian captivity. Cf. T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 154. The name Asmodaens (Tobit 3:8) for chief of the demons is borrowed directly from the Persian "Avesta."

hope to the Jews, disillusioned by Antiochus Epiphanes' desecration of the temple, by the promise of a world dominion by "one like unto a son of man."¹ The ultimate justice of God was to prevail in a resurrection in which "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt," - (Dan. 12: 2) I Enoch 6-36 (before 170 B.C.) attempts to answer the same question more fully by treating of the cause of evil;² of its prevalence upon the earth, due to evil spirits;³ and of its final remedy in a resurrection to torment, and to the Messianic Kingdom, at the second judgment.⁴ After the judgment, the righteous elect will be permitted to eat of the tree of life.⁵ I Enoch 83-90 (166 to 161 B.C.) adds little to this except to introduce the Messiah as a 'lamb.'⁶

1. Dan. 7:13, 14. It is hardly likely that this refers to an individual; it more likely refers to Israel as a nation, symbolized in the apocalyptic figure. cf. F.C. Burkitt, The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, p. 67.

2. I Enoch 6: 2 ff.; cf. Gen. 6: 1-4.

3. Ibid., 15: 8, 9; cf. Matt. 12: 24 ff., 45, and parallels.

4. Ibid., Ch. 25, 27; cf. Matt. 25: 46, and parallels.

5. Ibid., 25: 4, 5.

6. Ibid., 90: 38. The translation of the word is however doubtful. Cf. R.H. Charles, The Book of Enoch, p. 216, note

The divine deliverance assumes an ethical character in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (109 to 106 B.C.) Here we have the important combination of eschatology with ethics. The priestly Messiah who is descended from Levi (though the Messiah from Judah reappears in Judah 24: 5, 6 and Naphtali 4:5 due to a reaction against the Maccabean priest-kings)¹ will himself be free from sin, walk in meekness and righteousness, and in consequence will be a worthy mediator for the Gentiles who will be saved through the example and teaching of Israel.² This Prophet and Priest of the Most High will first engage in war against Israel's enemies, and Beliar and the powers of wickedness, delivering the souls of the saints and giving them power to tread on evil spirits.³ At the resurrection, the first to be raised will be the Old Testament heroes and patriarchs; the righteous will be put on the right hand, the wicked on the left.⁴ The importance of this moral-ethical teaching, moved by a missionary motive, and set in an eschatological background, in understanding the Synoptic teaching of Jesus can hardly be over-estimated.

1. Cf. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 225.

2. Reub. 6: 7-12, Lev. 8: 14, Judah 24: 1, Levi 14: 4.

3. Reub. 6: 12, Lev. 18: 11, Dan. 5: 10-12.

4. Benj. 10: 6-8; cf. Matt. Mt. 25: 33 f.

The Book of Jubilees (before 105 B.C.) introduces the idea of a Messianic kingdom which is already beginning.¹ The final judgment was to be preceded by the Messianic Woes and the repentance of Israel after which there would be a blessed immortality for the righteous spirits.² This book closes the second century writings in all of which (except in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and this Book of Jubilees) the Judgment takes place at the advent of the Messianic Kingdom; the resurrection is only partial; and the Messiah is hardly mentioned.³

The first century writings tend to dissociate personal immortality from the Kingdom, reserving it for heaven.⁴ This is particularly true of I Enoch 91-104, (104 to 95 B.C.) in which the righteous dead arise only as spirits.⁵ I Enoch 37-71 (94 to 64 B.C.) further develops the idea of a "new heavens and a new earth" of Isaiah, chapter 65 and 66, and raises the Messiah to a supernatural figure. The term 'Son of Man' which, in Daniel, is representative of the coming Kingdom of Israel's saints, designates in

1. Jubilees 1: 29; 4: 26. Such an expectation was often cherished in the prosperous days of the Maccabees. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 236.

2. Ibid., 23: 13 ff.

3. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 242, 243 ff.

4. This is possibly due to lack of confidence by the pious in John Hyrkanus and in the future of Israel, W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, p. 13.

5. I Enoch 100: 5.

I Enoch to a supernatural person, who is judge, champion, and eternal ruler of the righteous elect.¹ The Messiah, himself, is variously named the Righteous One, and the Elect One, besides being called 'that Son of Man.'² He is the representative of wisdom, power, light, and life and is, himself, the final judge.³ At his judgment the dead will be raised to be judged by the 'Elect One'⁴ (51: 1-5), and the righteous elect shall enjoy the spectacle of the punishment of the wicked (62: 9-12),⁵ after which "the Lord of Spirits will abide over them,

And with that Son of Man shall they
eat,
And lie down and rise up for ever
and ever.⁶
And the righteous and elect shall
have risen from the earth,
And ceased to be of downcast countenance.

1. Ibid., 46: 1f., where the term obviously is taken from Daniel. Cf. also 48: 2: H.L. Jackson, The Eschatology of Jesus, pp. 198, 199; cf. F.C. Burkitt, Op. cit., p. 67.

2. Ibid., 38: 2, 53: 6; cf. Acts 3: 14, 7: 52, 22: 14. Also I Enoch 40: 5, 45: 3, 4; cf. Luke 9: 35, 23: 35.

3. Ibid., 42, 49: 3, 46: 3, 49: 2, 4, 51: 1, 61: 5, 62: 15, 53: 6. Also, as judge, 46: 2-4, 48: 2ff, 54: 6.

4. Not only the dead who are raised but Azâzêl and all his associates and demonic hosts are judged. Ibid., 55: 4.

5. Cf. Luke 18: 7 where the same motif is followed. See especially I Enoch 47: 1, 2.

6. Cf. Matt. 19: 29 and parallels, also John 14: 2, 3. The parables of the kingdom often carry the picture of feasting and fellowship.

And they shall have been clothed
 with garments of glory,
 And these shall be the garments of
life¹ from the Lord of Spirits:
 And your garments shall not grow old,
 Nor your glory pass away before the
 Lord of Spirits." (62: 14-16).

The unending life of these righteous will be due to their participation in a new life-giving light which shall shine upon them.² This light consists in the knowledge of the secrets of righteousness which shall in that day pierce the darkness of ignorance and sin on the earth.³ The name for the light in I Enoch is "the light of eternal life."

This centrality, given to the Messiah by the author of the Parables, is also to be found in another contemporaneous work of this period, "The Psalms of Solomon," (70-40 B.C.). In it, the Messiah is to come from the House of David; become a "righteous king and taught of God" (17:35); "be pure from sin, so that he may rule a mighty people" (17: 41); and having gathered the dispersion (17: 28) and purged Jerusalem (17: 33), he will make Israel an exclusive and holy people (17: 29-31). His weapon for destroying the ungodly nations is the word of his mouth (17: 37, 41)

1. Could Matthew 22: 11 have reference to these garments? Cf. Rev. 3: 5.

2. I Enoch 58: 2, 3. Luke 16: 8; cf. also I Enoch. 108:11.

3. Ibid., 58: 3-6. This thought is obviously set in Persian dualistic framework, if with Jewish content. Cf. Mk. 4: 21, 22.

so as to make all nations subject to him (17: 31, 32, 33, 34.) However, the Messianic kingdom in which the restoration of the tribes of Israel takes place is apparently of temporary duration only (11: 1-8.) The final destiny of the righteous is to possess "life eternal" in which "their life shall be in the light of the Lord, and it shall fail no more." (3: 16). But "the inheritance of the sinners is destruction and darkness" so that "their iniquities shall pursue them as far as Hades beneath" (15: 11). Thus we find remarkable similarity between this and Enoch 91-94. The resurrection seems to be a resurrection of the body.

Judith (c. 50 B.C.) simply attests a further development of the idea of Gehenna as the final destination not only of the apostate Jews as in previous Jewish literature, but also for all the wicked, while the less important Sibylline Oracles III. 1-62 (before 32 B.C.) reiterates the expectation of a Messianic reign of long duration by a holy king.

In II Maccabees (100 to 40 B.C.) there is less emphasis on the Messianic kingdom. This writing is important in maintaining our previous contention that the hope in a resurrection arose from a sense of the present injustice of the world order and the conviction that God would vindicate His righteous servants beyond this world. We see

this conviction expressed in the words of the second brother to Antiochus before he died (7:9): "Thou, O miscreant, dost release us out of this present life, but the King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws unto an eternal revival of life."¹ This resurrection will be a resurrection of the body (7: 11, 22, 23; 14: 46) to be eternally enjoyed in the community of the righteous (7: 29). This conception of the resurrection may be compared again with the Parables of Enoch.

The doctrine of retribution in II Maccabees is also a significant aspect of its teaching. The punishment of the Israelites is regarded as corrective. But that of the Gentiles is vindictive (6: 13-15). However, this punishment, which will be meted out to the Gentiles and which is being meted out to Israel, occurs in this world and not in the world to come as in the Parables of Enoch. In II Maccabees there seems to be a hope that Israel as a nation will be vindicated in the present world order, but since the martyrs cannot share in this, they will receive their reward in the resurrection. A final point to notice is that "even the martyrs confess their sufferings as due to sin (7: 18, 33, 37), and pray that God's wrath may be

1. "εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ἵκνῃς"

expiated in their sufferings (7: 38)."¹ Hence we find here the belief that martyrdom of the few, and the sufferings entailed by it may, in some fashion, stay the wrath of God against the many by taking up the punishment due them. This may throw some light on Jesus' ministry of suffering "for the many" (Mk. 10: 45).

Characteristic of these writings of the first century before the birth of Jesus is the emphasis on the final judgment on all nations and on all angelic as well as human beings. The single significant exception to the belief that the judgment will come at the close of the Messianic kingdom is the Parables of Enoch, where the judgment takes place at the beginning of the final Messianic era. In the other writings, the Messianic Kingdom is temporary, while in this writing it is an eternal kingdom. The temporary abode for elect after death is in paradise where they continue until the judgment when they will be permitted a place in heaven. (I Enoch 61: 12, 70: 2 ff., 77: 3, 104: 2, 103: 4, 41: 2, 51: 4). On the other hand the gehenna is the abode for the wicked and fallen angels and is represented as a fiery furnace. The resurrection, sometimes believed to be of the spirit only, sometimes of the body transformed into angelic

1. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 278.

likeness, is held variously by the various writings. This resurrection will be for the righteous. As to the Messiah, He appears for the first time as the Supernatural Son of Man. He is to come of the lineage of David. The Gentiles have little hope in these writings except in the Psalms of Solomon where they are spared in the Messianic Kingdom. There will be no resurrection for them.

The change in the beliefs of the first century over those of the second century are chiefly in respect to the destiny of the departed spirits after the final judgment, and the centrality of the Messiah in the coming Kingdom. In the second century before the birth of Jesus, the hope extended to the righteous is directed toward a Messianic Kingdom in which, after being raised from the dead, they will participate. The first century offers the hope of an abiding place in heaven for these righteous. The trend is from this-worldly to other-worldly. On the other hand, the Messianic hope tends to become individualized in the figure of the Messiah, as can most readily be seen in the difference which the writer of I Enoch makes of the "Son of Man" concept in Daniel.¹

1. H.L. Jackson, "Eschatology of Jesus," pp. 198, 199; cf. F.C. Burkitt, The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, p. 67 f.

The writings of Jewish origin in the first century after the birth of Jesus are of more value in estimating and interpreting the writings of Paul and the Fourth Gospel than for the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. They are partly of Alexandrian origin and are therefore influenced by Greek Philosophy.

The Book of Jubilees (1-70 A.D.) makes its chief contribution to the study of the Synoptics in its parallels in angelology and demonology.¹ The angels are guardians of individuals much as in the New Testament (Jubilees 35: 17, cf. Matt. 18: 10, Acts 12: 15). On the other hand, the demons attack and seek to rule over men (Jubilees 10: 3, 6; cf. Mark 5: 1-20, Luke 11: 24-26, Matt. 12: 43-45) from whom men can only hope for release by the power of God. They are composed of an organized band of disembodied spirits whose leader is Mâstêmâ, or Satan (10: 9; cf. Mark 3: 22 ff.) Their final punishment will take place at the Judgment of Mâstêmâ (10:8) "or the setting up of the Messianic Kingdom when Satan will be no longer able to injure mankind," (23: 29).² This is probably the explanation of the saying of Jesus, "And if I by

1. Cf. also the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Strack-Billerbeck's comments, Vol. IV, Part II, p. 804.

2. R.H. Charles, The Book of Jubilees, p. lxxxvi.

Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you" (Luke 11: 19, 20; cf. Matt. 12: 27, 28).

The destruction of the ~~Satanic~~ powers and the overcoming of their hold on men happens with the advent of the Messianic age (Mark 3: 27 f.) Furthermore, the Messianic woes preceding the end of the age are vividly described, which are to increase until Israel learns the error of her ways and repents (23: 13, 14, 18, 19, 22 and 23: 16, 26; cf. Mark 13: 14-27). The Assumption of Moses does not add anything significant to this.

The works of Alexandrian Judaism need only be treated very briefly at those points where they throw any light on the synoptic teaching of Jesus or on the Pauline and Johannean writings. As R.H. Charles says, "All these works are more or less leavened by Greek Philosophy. But their writers, however saturated with Greek ideas, remain essentially Jews. Their aim is practical, not speculative; is ethical, not metaphysical."¹ The Greek influence shows itself in the following concepts: matter is eternal and evil, hence there is no resurrection of the flesh; man's soul was first pre-existent, then descended to enter the

1. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 303.

body; and the award of blessedness or torment after death will be an immediate one with no intermediate period intervening. Hence, in view of such concepts, these works contribute chiefly to the understanding of the Pauline and Johannine writings.

The Book of Wisdom and Philo's works relate themselves to the Fourth Gospel in their teaching about Sophia and the Logos. In the Book of Wisdom, the life of divine wisdom leads man to attain incorruption (2: 23, 3: 1-4). For Philo, God is the fountain of the Logos (πηγὴ λόγου) and so the source of the higher Logos life (λογικὴ ζωὴ) in distinction from the lower life (poster Cain 20. II, 15 C.W.)¹

II Enoch introduces the Tree of Life and continues in a Jewish strain when he speaks of the final existence of the righteous in incorruptible heavenly bodies (22: 8-10) in which state the righteous are described as being clothed with the garments of God's glory. Fourth Maccabees uses the gospel expression "in Abraham's bosom" for the final state after death, but unlike the gospel reference which seems to refer to the intermediate state of the departed, this has reference to heaven (17: 5, 18; cf. Luke 16: 22). II Baruch is of interest because of its apparent prejudice

1. See Julius Grill, Untersuchung über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums, p. 208.

against Enoch in its attributing a number of revelations and achievements to Moses which had formerly been attributed to Enoch (Ch. 59). Charles finds in this a clear sign of Jewish hostility to Christianity.¹ If this be true, the value of I Enoch is greatly enhanced as a source for the New Testament writings since this gives evidence of the influence of I Enoch before II Baruch was written (between 60 and 100 A.D.)

Fourth Ezra is of interest because of the light which it throws on the Pauline conflict with Judaism over the Law, works, justification, original sin, and free will. In opposition to Baruch who says, "Each one is Adam to his own soul" (54: 19), the writer of Fourth Ezra laments, "O Adam, what hast thou done, the evil is not fallen on thee alone but upon all us that came of thee" (7: 118). Consequently, in Fourth Ezra, there is no optimism for the ultimate destiny of the majority of people. Though many are created, few will be saved, (8: 1-3).

This completes the list of the important writings and their contributions in this century. The writings of Josephus have already been referred to and his writings may be considered fairly trustworthy except in his Jewish Wars (Book III, Ch. viii, 5) where he describes as Jewish the

1. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 327, 328.

belief that the soul as a particle of divinity is taken into the mortal body, to be received into heaven after death of the righteous whence again it is reincarnated in a pure body. This however had no influence on New Testament thought.

When certain dogmas of these apocalyptic writings are assembled, their importance as explanatory of New Testament thought is readily apparent. The following phases of apocalyptic thought are therefore of definite interest to the understanding of the teaching of Jesus, as well as of the Pauline and Johannine writings:

1. The righteous are assured of God's ultimate vindication, if not in this life, then in the life to come.
2. There will be a resurrection of the righteous and wicked in bodily form to be followed by the Judgment.
3. The Messiah, designated as the Son of Man, a supernatural figure from heaven will be judge; will gather his righteous Elect; and will live in ultimate fellowship with them in his Kingdom. In most instances, however, God Himself is the final Judge.
4. This event will be preceded by the Messianic Woes and the vicarious suffering of the righteous entailed by them.
5. Satan and his demons, who have possession of the earth, will be overcome, and the deliverance of the righteous will be achieved by the Messiah.
6. Eternal life is life in a transformed, supernatural, incorruptible body lived with the Messiah and God in light, righteousness and fellowship.
7. The divine Sophia or Logos imparts this life and incorruption from God.
8. Death is due to the entrance of sin into the world through Adam.
9. Righteousness is essentially love of God and love to man.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF RABBINIC JUDAISM.

Strack and Billerbeck point out the contrast between the teaching of the Pseudepigrapha and that of post-Christian rabbinic eschatology in their respective doctrines of the Gan Eden and the final salvation.¹ The pre-Christian Pseudepigrapha tell of the Gan Eden and final salvation being realized in the time of the Messiah. But rabbinic teachers in post Christian times, who distinguished sharply between the day of the Messiah and the Olam Ha-ba² (the Coming Age or Future World), conceive of the latter as the final consummation for the righteous alone. In old rabbinic teaching, the Gan Eden was actually the Paradise of Adam which was to be on the earth. Only in small circles where there was a tendency to spiritualize was exception to this taken among those who expected the consummation to be realized, not in the present, but in the "yonder" world.

According to the earthly conception of the Gan Eden, it had its location near Jerusalem, near the valley of Hinnon. God would teach the Torah. The righteous would

1. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. IV, Pt. II, pp. 1145 ff. For the contrast between the ideas of Paradise and the garden of God, see W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, p.328.

2. אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

receive of the fruit of life from the tree of life. A feast also was promised which God would prepare for His righteous. It was known variously as the "feast of the righteous," "feast of deliverance," "feast of Leviathan," or "feast of Gan Eden." In the Pseudepigrapha it was to appear in the Day of the Messiah when the Leviathan and Behemoth would be consumed. However, some rabbis denied that the feast would come in the Day of the Messiah, but instead in the final day of a heavenly Gan Eden. In the meal as sometimes represented, the cup of deliverance was to be taken and praise given as did David of old (Ps. 116: 13). The meal was to be in honor of God the Highest, when David would repeat his praise. Such an old celebration of a meal before Jehovah, in anticipation of the Messianic time, may have been the source for the Messianic hopes which accompanied the celebration of the Paschal meal at the Last Supper of Jesus and his disciples. Otto suggests that there existed, in circles where the Messiah was awaited, such grace at meals as later became general among the Jews:

"May thy lovingkindness esteem us worthy of the day of the Messiah and the future life."

"May thy lovingkindness send us the prophet Elias, who brings us the message of happiness, salvation, and trust." 1.

1. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 236.

The Rabbis also used the term "Kingdom of Heaven" in a special sense. As Manson says:

"The Rabbis used the term 'Kingdom of Heaven' sometimes with an inward reference, to denote the abstract supremacy of the Law of God in the heart. Whoever undertook to keep the Law of God was in that sense said to accept the yoke of 'the Kingdom of Heaven'.¹ The daily recitation of the Shema, with confession of one God, and an undertaking to keep his commandments (Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21) was sufficient to make a proselyte a member of the kingdom. Besides this legal sense of the term, there was also another according to which the Kingdom of God signified little more than God's order of Providence. Disappointment with history had the result in many minds of depressing the thought of the Kingdom to a general idea of the almighty power of God in Nature and human history, though always with special reference to Israel."²

Dalman holds that the "Kingdom of Heaven" meant simply the sovereignty of God¹ and that to inherit means to take possession of,³ and to enter into it means to attain to it.⁴ It is in this sense of "sovereignty of God" that Dalman believes Jesus used the term "Kingdom of Heaven." He used the term because of its regard for the honor of

1. Cf. G. Dalman, Words of Jesus, pp. 94 ff. Cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 434.

2. W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, p. 69. Quotation is from F. Barth, Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu, p. 39.

3. Op. cit., p. 125.

4. Ibid., p. 116.

God which should take absolute precedence in man's loyalty in order that mankind might through full obedience find salvation in intimate relation to God. The establishment of God's reign must mean ultimate happiness for those who experienced it.¹

On the other hand, much recent opinion agrees with Manson who says of this form of abstract reference to the Kingdom of God:

"But while these abstract usages of the term were familiar, no one would associate them with such a proclamation as that with which Jesus began His ministry. Whoever said, 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God has drawn nigh' (Mark i. 15), by his very language made it plain that no timeless or abstract interpretation of the term was intended, but that the words were to be taken in their high eschatological or Messianic sense as a reference to the coming era of redemption." 2.

One further problem presents itself for solution in determining the relation of the teaching of Jesus to the contemporary thought of the times in which he lived. It is the problem of the direct dependence of the synoptic teaching of Jesus on the contemporary literature of the period. The question naturally arises whether Jesus Himself was dependent on this literature, not only for His ideas but for His forms of expression, or whether,

1. G. Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 137.

2. Op. cit., pp. 69, 70; cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 38.

especially in respect to the apocalyptic literature, these expressions were taken by the writers of the synoptic gospels from the contemporary literature and put into the mouth of Jesus. To this problem we now further address ourselves.

As for Jesus' use of the Old Testament, much could be said of it beyond what has been hitherto written. The critical problem of determining exactly which sayings from the Old Testament, attributed to Jesus, are actually His, is one which time or space here forbids the treatment. Moore points out that Jesus' knowledge of the Old Testament is remarkably wide, embracing the Pentateuch, Prophets, Psalms, and occasionally other writings of the Hagiographa, "and the aptness with which (his references) are adduced evince notable intimacy with Scripture."¹ Toy further indicates the contrast between Jesus' references to the Old Testament and those of the Evangelists:

"The quotations by the Evangelists themselves, relating to the Life of Christ, are all from the Prophets and Psalms except Luke 2:23, 24, from Exodus 13:2; Leviticus 12:8; and perhaps John 19:36; from Exodus 12:46..... The citations from the Law, with the above exceptions, are in the course of legal and ethical discussions by Jesus; and the mass of His quotations also are from the Prophets and Psalms."²

1. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 289.

2. C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament, p. xxxii.

He further states that the writer of Matthew quotes for his special purpose from what appears to have been an Aramaic version of the Old Testament, and that these quotations "are all intended to prove the Messiahship of Jesus, and they are characterized by a mechanical literalness, especially those that are peculiar to him."¹

A striking contrast is to be found in Jesus' own interpretation and unliteral treatment of the Jewish scriptures. Jesus uses the Scriptures to meet and interpret the situation, rather than fit the situation to a particular passage of Scripture. Of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament, Jesus quotes from fourteen, i.e. each of the books of the Pentateuch, Samuel, Kings, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, and Micah. His favorite books were Deuteronomy, Psalms, and Isaiah. The degree to which these three books lend themselves to the individual and national hope so as to render it eschatological and at the same time ethical make them significant in the interpretation of the teaching of Jesus. For the interpretations of Jesus are scarcely at all new. We may find parallels to the sayings of Jesus in the sermon on the mount in the Rabbinic sayings that have been handed down.

1. C.H.Toy, Op. cit., pp. xxxiii and xxxiv.

But they remain as single sentences, always pushed back into the ocean of legality.¹

As for the contemporary apocalyptic literature, the deduction may too hastily be made that Jesus was intimately acquainted with these works and used them extensively, or on the other hand that Jesus had very little knowledge of these works and only used from them indirectly if at all. Moore says that Jesus' knowledge of the apocalyptic literature could be scarcely more than hearsay.² On the other hand Booth says:

"A careful study of these (Apocryphal) books, which came out of the Hellenistic group in Judaism,³ reveals remarkable parallels in language and ideas with our New Testament literature. Paul and the other New Testament writers seem to have been thoroughly familiar with the Hellenistic literature.

"And the same fact holds good for the Gospels. Jesus' words, as quoted in these four books, offer a number of such striking parallels to these Hellenistic books that we must conclude, either that their language and ideas had so saturated Palestinian thought in his day that he became familiar with them in this indirect fashion, or else that he himself was familiar with their contents at first hand. The latter seems the more probable hypothesis."⁴

1. H. Lietzmann, Geschichte der Alten Kirche, p. 42.

2. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 288.

3. Reference is made to the following books: Ecclesiasticus, The Wisdom of Solomon, Second Esdras, The Assumption of Moses, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Books of Enoch. Cf. R.H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 207 ff.; W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, pp. 10 ff.

4. H.K. Booth, The World of Jesus, p. 38 f.



In order to estimate Booth's view, it will be necessary to review and criticize the evidence which he presents as concisely as possible. In the first place, much of the literature Booth classes as Hellenistic originated in Palestine and shows little if any Hellenistic influence. Of these R.H. Charles classes only The Wisdom of Solomon as definitely Hellenistic.¹ He refers first to the Wisdom Literature and to Ecclesiasticus in particular. And in the parallels presented, an examination shows that the relation to the Synoptic Gospels need not be a direct one. For Jesus' words, "Swear not at all" (Matt. 5: 34), Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) says, "Accustom not thyself to swearing" (23: 9), which is indeed a quite different teaching. The positive exhortation "Give to him that asketh thee" (Matt. 5: 42) is put in the negative form "Reject not the supplication of the afflicted" (Ecclus. 4: 4) following the old Hebrew negative emphasis. The expression "taking the yoke" (Matt. 11: 29; cf. Ecclus. 51: 26) is not uncommon in rabbinic literature, and whereas the golden rule is applied to doing by Jesus (Matt. 7: 12), it is applied to judging by Ben Sirach (31: 15). As to the matter of forgiveness (Matt. 6: 14; cf. Ecclus. 28: 2) there is so much of parallel rabbinic teaching² which corresponds to this, that while

1. Eschatology, pp. 224 f, 301 ff.; cf. W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums etc., pp. 10 ff., 18 ff.

2. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. I, p. 424.

the sources may be the same, there is not necessarily interdependence. So far as the other book which represents the Wisdom Literature is concerned, all the parallels quoted in the Wisdom of Solomon are parallels to the Fourth Gospel. As for the Apocalypse of Ezra and the Assumption of Moses, (both being unlikely of Hellenistic origin) all except one of the parallel passages quoted are from the "Little Apocalypse" (Matt. 24: 1-36 - Mark 13: 1-32 - Luke 21: 5-33), which was unlikely to have come from Jesus Himself.¹ Yet even granting that parallels do exist, the context is so entirely different in the respective literature, that quotations are more likely derived from a common source rather than from the respective literature. Therefore the one parallel passage outside of the Little Apocalypse (Matt. 23: 37 - II Esdras 13: 16) may be derived from a common source.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, however, offer many more striking parallels than those quoted above. Quoting Booth, "There is in the book an amazing breadth and universality, for it even proclaims the redemption of the Gentiles So strikingly close and frequent are the parallels between this book and Jesus' words that it is difficult not to believe that he

1. B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, cf. in particular Ch. XI, pp. 120 ff. See further B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 491 ff.

knew it first hand."¹

The detailed comparison of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs with the synoptic passages by Charles² makes it plain that the relation of the two is extraordinary, not only in literary similarity but the spirit of the teaching in its context. Certain parts read almost like a commentary on the Gospels. However, the most striking teaching, not only in its similarity of spirit but in its literary similarity is the teaching on forgiveness. Charles makes this comparison which, when made with the earlier Lukan form of the 'Q' passage is especially significant:

Ἐὰν ἁμάρτη ὁ ἀδελφός
σου ἐπιτίμῃσόν αὐτῷ
καὶ ἔὰν μετανοήσῃ
ἄφες αὐτῷ.

Luke 17: 3

Ἐὰν τις ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς
σέ εἰπὲς αὐτῷ ἐν εἰρήνῃ
καὶ ἔὰν
μετανοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῷ.

T Gad 6:3 (B)

also

Ἐὰν μὴ ἀφῆτε ἕκαστος
τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ
τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν.

Matt. 18: 35

Ἄφες αὐτῷ ἀπὸ
καρδίας.

T Gad 5: 7 (B)

"That the N.T. passages are here dependent cannot reason-

1. H.K. Booth, The World of Jesus, p. 42.

2. R.H. Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, pp. lxxviii. ff.

ably be denied," says Charles.¹ We should go further to say that Jesus' teaching here was influenced directly by the Testaments of the Twelve.

The passage relative to loving God and one's neighbour is one of the first literary sources to conjoin the two commandments. Passages in the Sermon on the Mount relative to purity of the heart, singleness or soundness of the eye, generosity, and receiving in proportion to the way one deals, all carry certain verbal affinities in the two writings as well as affinities of thought.² As to the conception of evil influences, the same ideas prevail in the Testaments as in the Gospels. Seven evil spirits are mentioned in the Testaments as also in Matthew (Reub. 2: 2 - Matt. 12: 45). The ideas of the Kingdom are in many respects parallel, as, for instance, with regard to the twelve thrones for the twelve tribes of Israel (T. Jud. 25: 1, T. Zeb. 10: 2, T. Benj. 10: 6, - Matt. 19: 28), the righteous on the right hand (T. Benj. 10:6 - 25: 33, 34), and the final judgment on the basis of merciful deeds (T. Jos. 1: 5, 6 - Matt. 25: 35, 36). This latter parallel deserves also to be quoted:

1. R.H. Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, pp. lxxviii, lxxix.

2. Matt. 5: 28 - T. Benj. 8: 2
 " 6: 16 - T. Zeb. 8: 6
 " 6:22f.- T. Iss. 3: 4
 " 5: 42 - T. Zeb. 7: 2
 " 7: 2 - T. Zeb. 5: 3

<u>Ἐπείνασα γὰρ καὶ</u>	<u>Ἐν λιμῇ συνεσχέθην, καὶ</u>
<u>ἔδωκάτε μοι φαγεῖν</u>	<u>αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος διέθρεψέ</u>
<u>..... ἡσθένησα</u>	<u>με..... ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ</u>
<u>καὶ ἐπεσκέψασθέ με,</u>	<u>ἡμην καὶ ὁ Κύριος</u>
<u>ἐν φυλακῇ ἡμην</u>	<u>ἐπεσκέψατό με, ἐν</u>
<u>καὶ ἦλθατε πρὸς με.</u>	<u>φυλακῇ ἡμην καὶ θεὸς</u>
	<u>μου ἐχαρίτωσέ με.</u>

Lukan parallels include the power given by Jesus to his disciples to tread on the powers of evil.¹ The others are somewhat doubtful.

The passages herein presented do not include all passages which show similarity of ideas. But the cumulative evidence for the influence of the Testaments on the Gospels is very convincing. Noteworthy is the fact that the most significant parallels are in the teaching of Jesus. Furthermore, the influence which the Testaments exercised on the Talmud,² indicates what must have been the influence of apocalyptic circles on the rabbinic teaching at a period of Jewish history contemporaneous with Jesus. The parallel passages conform in some instances to original sayings of Jesus contained in the 'Q' material and in others to Logia peculiar to Matthew.³

1. Luke 10: 19, 20: T. Sim. 6: 6; T. Lev. 18: 12.

2. R.H. Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve, pp. lxxiv, lxxv.

3. Cf. in particular the passage above on forgiveness. Luke obviously retains the oldest 'Q' form.

On the whole the Testaments point the way to the combination of the ethical and eschatological in the teaching of Jesus, and show that there was not necessarily any conflict in the Jewish mind between the two.

With regard to the influence of I Enoch on the New Testament, Charles says: "The influence of I Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books taken together."¹ Its wide influence on the age is to be seen in the number of parallels and citations in the literature of the age.² The Book of Jubilees was largely drawn from it and uses it repeatedly for its source. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs contain nine direct references to a book of Enoch although six of the references cannot be traced directly to any passage in I Enoch. Other passages are to some degree parallel. These parallels must be of interest in view of the influence of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs on the Gospels. Another book, the Assumption of Moses, likewise influenced by Enoch, was written in all probability during the lifetime of Jesus. Finally, the Apocalypse of Baruch and Fourth Ezra (Second Esdras), each having parallels in diction to the Gospels, have parallels to the Book of Enoch.

1. R.H. Charles, The Book of Enoch, p. xcv.

2. Ibid., pp. lxx ff.

Turning to the New Testament, we find a growing influence of this book on the writings ranging from the Gospels to Revelation. The influence of I Enoch on the New Testament is unlike that of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs whose influence is large in the Gospels and Paul but diminishes in the later literature and is almost lost in the Patristic Writings.¹ The influence of the Book of Enoch proceeds in the opposite fashion. The fewest parallels (if any) are in the teaching of Jesus; many more are in Paul's writings; then a host of parallels are in the Revelation of John as well as in the Patristic writings. Because of the growing importance attached to this writing's influence on the interpretation of the teaching and self-consciousness of Jesus, some parallels in the Gospels may repay examination in order to find the nature and extent of its influence on them. In order to ascertain whether the book influenced Jesus directly, parallels should be sought especially in Markan and 'Q' material, then in the special Logia of Matthew, Luke's special material, and finally in the other sources peculiar to Matthew. Furthermore, allowance should be made for expressions which may have become current in the age, and consequently are not peculiar to I Enoch.

1. R.H. Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, pp. lxxv ff.

Beginning with Luke 1:52 which is parallel to I Enoch 46:4, we have before us a portion of the infancy narrative of the Gospel, which is probably of late origin. Two Lukan passages (9:35 and 23:35) make reference to Jesus as the 'chosen of God,' the first being in the words from the cloud at the transfiguration, the second being in the words of scorn of the rulers at the crucifixion. The term 'the Elect One' also occurs frequently in Enoch to designate the Messiah (45:3,4, 49:2,4, etc.) However, in each instance where this term is used in Luke, it is omitted in the parallel Gospels. It may be said to be characteristic of Luke and not necessarily a term originally applied to Jesus. The expressions "sons of light" (Luke 16:8) and "mammon of unrighteousness" (Luke 16:9) which correspond to "generation of light" (Enoch 108:11) and "unrighteous gains" (Enoch 63:10) scarcely show more than the resemblance of expressions common to the age. As regards the relation of Luke 18:7, which tells of God's vengeance in behalf of the elect, to Enoch 41: 1,2, Montefiore attributes the Lukan passage to an entirely different source: "There seems to be a pretty certain borrowing from Sirach xxxiv. 15-19 - a passage which also speaks of the judgment and the punishment of enemies."¹ Although he does not agree with them, Monte-

1. C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. II, p. 1018 (First Edition); cf. 2nd Ed. p. 554. Cf. A.S. Peake, "Peake's Commentary on the Bible," p. 737. The passage in the English version is Ecclesiasticus 35: 15-19.

fiore admits: "Some think that, like that of the importunate friend, it (this parable) was originally meant to teach the general duty of prayer." In the light of the evidence we have from the oldest sources of Jesus' teaching on forgiveness, this passage seems difficult to reconcile with his ethic. The next passage from Luke (21:28 "your redemption draweth nigh" cf. Enoch 51:2) finds no parallel expression in the corresponding passages in the other two synoptic Gospels (Matt. 24:31, Mk. 13:27). Other parallels between Luke and Enoch are scarcely close enough to show verbal affinity.

A comparison of these passages ^{shows} ^ that in almost every case where I Enoch may have effected the Gospel of Luke, the expression is peculiar to Luke alone. Where the other synoptic Gospels have parallel passages, the Lukan expression is omitted in them.

Turning to Matthew's Gospel, the same may be observed. This is particularly obvious from the expression, "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8: 29 b) as compared with Mark and Luke which omit the implication that the demons are fearing their final judgment (Enoch 16: 1) and reduce the saying to simply, "Torment me not." (Mark 5: 7; Luke 8: 28). Of Matthew's doctrine of 'gehenna' and the passages relating thereto (Matt. 13: 42; also 5: 22, 29, 30; 10: 28) and their comparison with I Enoch (98: 3;

also 27: 2, 90: 26, 27), it is to be admitted that this doctrine of 'Gehenna' as the final place of punishment as found in I Enoch was likely to have been adopted by Jesus Himself. Yet the doctrine was no doubt fairly widely accepted from I Enoch and other writings by the circles where Jesus moved.

Again the influence of I Enoch seems to have been operating later in shaping the words of Jesus in Matt. 19: 28, - "When the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory" - from I Enoch 62: 5, - "When they see the Son of Man sitting on the throne of His glory," ^{assuming that} Luke's form of the saying, - "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me" - is the earliest. Montefiore says: "Volter thinks that the verse in Matthew is based upon Luke xxi. 28-30 and represents its latest form. The 'Son of Man' in its later sense as equivalent to Jesus in his capacity of apocalyptic judge and king has been added by Matthew (Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesus, p. 16)."¹ In any case what Streeter says relative to the passage holds true: "This is a good example of the currency of widely different versions of the same saying; and since neither in Matthew nor in Luke is it found in a Q context, we naturally assign the two versions to M. and to L."²

1. C.G. Montefiore, Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 697 (1st Ed.). See further also Weiss' arguments regarding the whole passage as indicated by Montefiore.

2. B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 288.

Robinson very definitely discounts the saying as coming from Jesus when he says: "The greater part of ver. 28 is inserted by this evangelist, and there can be little hesitation in attributing the addition to his eschatological interests."¹ Thus the possibility that the form as we have it was shaped in the process of transmission has considerable support.

There is a further parallel in the reference to the apostles as sitting on twelve thrones. However the reference approaches much nearer the parallels in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as indicated above, than I Enoch 108: 12 where reference is made to the righteous in general, - "I will seat each on the throne of his honour." The same theological point of view of the Messiah's judgment of demons by casting them into the lake of fire also occurs in Matthew 25: 41 which seems to be derived from I Enoch 54: 4, 5. This final authority resting with the Messiah is the closing note struck by Matthew's Gospel in the declaration of Jesus, "All authority hath been given to me in heaven and on earth" (28: 18). These words find their parallel in I Enoch in the expression, "(the Son of Man) who rules over all" (62: 6).² Again the woe pronounced by Jesus upon his

1. H.R. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 163.

2. C.G. Montefiore, "The Synoptic Gospels", Vol. II, p. 357 (2nd Edition). Of this verse he says: "The words are based upon Daniel VII. 14 (but cf. also Matt. XI. 27). The historic Jesus would have been greatly amazed had he been told that such a comprehensive claim was to be put into his mouth. In fact the words spoken are a résumé of the Christian faith and of the Church's mission, as the resurrection made them." "It is the glorified Christ who instructs future generations."

Robinson very definitely discounts the saying as coming from Jesus when he says: "The greater part of ver. 28 is inserted by this evangelist, and there can be little hesitation in attributing the addition to his eschatological interests."¹ Thus the possibility that the form as we have it was shaped in the process of transmission has considerable support.

There is a further parallel in the reference to the apostles as sitting on twelve thrones. However the reference approaches much nearer the parallels in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as indicated above, than I Enoch 108: 12 where reference is made to the righteous in general, - "I will seat each on the throne of his honour." The same theological point of view of the Messiah's judgment of demons by casting them into the lake of fire also occurs in Matthew 25: 41 which seems to be derived from I Enoch 54: 4, 5. This final authority resting with the Messiah is the closing note struck by Matthew's Gospel in the declaration of Jesus, "All authority hath been given to me in heaven and on earth" (28: 18). These words find their parallel in I Enoch in the expression, "(the Son of Man) who rules over all" (62: 6).² Again the woe pronounced by Jesus upon his

1. H.R. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 163.

2. C.G. Montefiore, "The Synoptic Gospels", Vol. II, p. 357 (2nd Edition). Of this verse he says: "The words are based upon Daniel VII. 14 (but cf. also Matt. XI. 27). The historic Jesus would have been greatly amazed had he been told that such a comprehensive claim was to be put into his mouth. In fact the words spoken are a résumé of the Christian faith and of the Church's mission, as the resurrection made them. "It is the glorified Christ who instructs future generations."

betrayers (Mark 14: 21; Matt. 26: 24) has a form similar to that pronounced upon sinners before the judgment in I Enoch 38: 2. But like the expression "inherit eternal life" (19:29; cf. I Enoch 40:9) this expression may have been one commonly current in the age.

While the evidence in certain instances may be open to objection, the cumulative evidence points to an indirect rather than direct influence of I Enoch upon the actual teaching of Jesus. The direct influence of I Enoch appears chiefly in the theological forms in which the early church interpreted the life and teachings of Jesus. Because of the widespread knowledge of I Enoch and the reverence with which it was held in Jewish circles as well as because of its developed concept of the Messiah as an individual who Himself comes bringing the Kingdom, the early Christian community may have found it effective in defending their claims for the Messiahship of Jesus. Otto seems to have overlooked this possibility when he interprets the life and teaching of Jesus by I Enoch.¹

These two phases of eschatology, the ethical as over against the theological, God's demand as over against God's plan must be distinguished from each other in understanding Jesus' use of the eschatology of his day. As we have seen

1. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, pp. 331 ff.

by analyzing the apocalyptic writings of Jesus' day, and by comparing them with his teaching, their direct contribution to Jesus' teaching lies on the side of the practical ethical demand of God. The speculative side appears only in the background. Yet this ethic of Jesus, if ethic it may be called, could never have brought the radically new life without the sense of the reality of the impending eschaton.

The evidence herein presented may appear to indicate that the influence of I Enoch led the synoptic writers to shape their materials to some extent from this writing, and to place on the words of Jesus an interpretation which he never intended. Was the apocalyptic tinge in the teaching of Jesus imposed upon it by a later age due to the influence of such writings as this? A strong eschatological trend is observable in Matthew's Gospel. The instances of parallels between I Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels show evidence that the authors of these gospels were using I Enoch to interpret the teaching and person of Jesus. Nevertheless the question occurs, were they not right to do so?

In the first place the apocalyptic idea cannot be eliminated from the earliest synoptic materials.¹ Further-

1. W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, p. 65.

more, the wide influence of I Enoch in Jewish circles is attested by its influence on Jewish writings of the age as well as the New Testament.¹ The number of expressions in it which were also current in the age have already been indicated.

Turning to Jesus' own teaching we find that he seems to assume the beliefs about the Kingdom of God and eternal life already existing in his day. Furthermore, Jesus seems to have relied directly on the Testaments of the Twelve, a Book also dependent on I Enoch. Hence there are many obscurities for us today, as well as for the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, which are clarified by the use of contemporaneous literature. Although Jesus appears not to quote directly from I Enoch, he does seem to rely on its ideas for many of his great concepts. Such ideas as the coming of the new age introduced by a judgment,² the coming of the Son of Man to judge³ preceding the final reign of righteousness, the identification of the Son of Man with the Messiah⁴ on high, and the conditions of the life to come⁵ are greatly clarified by reference to I Enoch and especially to the Parables (Ch. 37-71).

1. R.H. Charles, The Book of Enoch, pp. lxx ff.

2. I Enoch 45: 3-5; Mk. 8: 38, 10: 30.

3. Ibid., 45: 3; 46: 3,4; cf. Mark 8: 38.

4. Cf. R.H. Charles, The Book of Enoch, p. 86 f; cf. Mk. 12: 35-37.

5. I Enoch 58: 2-6; 40: 9; 62: 14-16; cf. Mk. 10:17, 30; Mk. 14: 25; Matt. 22: 1 ff.

This survey indicates the influences which determined the currents of thought as well as of life in the New Testament Age. Precise evidence has been presented so as to indicate as accurately as possible which currents of thought were more influential with Jesus, and which were more influential subsequently with Paul and with the author of the Fourth Gospel. Jesus will appear to have been more greatly influenced by the immediate and practical-ethical side of eschatology, and his teaching is more in conjunction with writings which unfold this aspect. Paul seems to be more greatly influenced by the theological and metaphysical aspect of eschatology. The author of the Fourth Gospel combines the metaphysical with the mystical, telescoping the eschatological into the present experience of the life of the believer. But the inestimable contribution of their Hebrew heritage is the absoluteness of obedience to the Will of God and the conviction that God will vindicate such righteousness, either here or hereafter, with the gift of an abundant life.

CHAPTER II.

JESUS PROCLAIMS LIFE.

Jesus lived in no empty world. He lived in a critical age. And as the previous chapter discloses, his message was moulded by the life and thought of his age. Thus he appears to have made use of the literature and thought of the times in his proclamation of the new life of the Kingdom.¹

Since Jesus himself seldom if ever spoke Greek,² we need to turn to the Hebrew equivalents for the ideas behind the Greek terms for life. The extraordinary insignificance of the term βίος in the Gospels, in contrast with its importance in Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy, must be attributed to this difference in Hebrew interpretation. Not the βίος (character) but the ψυχή (animating force), as it wins its full meaning as given by and as responsible to God,

1. Mark 1: 15. Charles Guignebert, Jesus, p. 330, contends that Jesus' negligence in defining the kingdom was due to his assuming the current ideas about it. While this is in some measure true, we shall see how the parables were intended to modify the current view so as to introduce a new aspect of the Kingdom hitherto unrecognized. But it is first necessary to show the aspects of Jesus' teaching which assume the current eschatological ideas. Cf. H.L. Jackson, The Eschatology of Jesus, pp. 284 ff.

2. S. Angus, The Environment of Early Christianity, pp. 218, 219.

is truly significant.¹ On the other hand, ζωή generally retains the idea of the Hebrew חַיָּה, the vital force or power.² This Hebrew equivalent also implies outward prosperity or success. A similar correspondence is to be found between ψυχή and the Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ which generally refers to the life principle, the seat of the physical life with its affections and desires. If any part of man's present life continues after death, this is the part which has the continued existence.

THE SYNOPTIC OCCURRENCES OF ZOE.

An examination of the passages in the Synoptic Gospels in which Zoe is used as life, seems to show signs of the influence of the current eschatology.³ In the instance of the young man who came to Jesus, his enquiry-"What must I do to inherit eternal life?"⁴-indicated that he expected this

1. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., B. II., Lief. 13, 14, pp. 836 ff.

2. Ibid., Lief., 14, p. 864. Cf. Thayer's Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament (1898).

3. A detailed treatment of these passages in the light of synoptic criticism is required, so as to ascertain what Jesus really said.

4. Matt. 19: 16 ff.; Mark 10: 17 ff.; Luke 18: 18 ff. The same argument applies in the case of the young lawyer who enquires of Jesus how to "inherit eternal life" Luke 10: 25-28.

eternal life to be granted to him sometime in the future. It was an "inheritance," the conditions for which could be fulfilled now, but the granting of which awaited the future.¹ It may be contended that Jesus was using the enquiry of the young man in order to convey a spiritual lesson, and that Jesus himself did not accept the same view of eternal life as the young man.² But Jesus' agreement with the eschatological view is even more evident when Peter afterwards asks about the reward of those who left all to follow him. Not only does Jesus promise his followers manifold more in this age, but "in the world to come, eternal life."³ The line between the two ages is so plainly drawn that the eternal life is exclusively identified with the age to come.⁴

However, Zoe, is even more closely identified with the coming Kingdom when Jesus instructs his disciples to destroy any members of their bodies which prevent them from entering into life. The identity of 'life' with the future Kingdom

1. G. Dalman gives "inherit" the more positive sense of "take possession of." Cf. Words of Jesus, p. 125.

2. That Jesus accepted the view that the reward would be a future one is shown in His promise for the future - "thou shalt have (ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι) treasure in heaven." Mk. 10: 21.

3. Matt. 19: 29; Mark 10: 29; Lk. 18: 29. Cf. Lk. 10: 25-28.

4. Carpenter seems to regard this passage as due to a later hand, at least as it stands in Mark. The "with persecutions" in Mark may suggest a later revision, but only by doing violence to tradition can the whole be extracted. J. Carpenter, The First Three Gospels, p. 210. Cf. F. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. I, p. 281.

is readily apparent in reviewing the passage in question:

"And if thy hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off; it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into the Gehenna, into the unquenchable fire.¹ And if thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life halt, rather than having thy two feet to be cast into hell. And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, cast it out: it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into Gehenna; where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, (Mark 9: 43-48; cf. Matt. 18: 8, 9.)

Life, in this instance, is the future state of the righteous after the judgment,² and is contrasted with the state of the wicked who will be cast into Gehenna to suffer eternal torment. This new state of the righteous is easily made synonymous with the Kingdom of God, because the Kingdom is that new community of the righteous with its accompanying blessings, which for the individual member denotes eternal life. The contrast between the two destinies of man, in the Gehenna, and in the Kingdom, makes it apparent that life as identified with the Kingdom has here an eschatological significance.³

1. Omit verses 44 and 46 - X B C L Δ and a number of cursives.

2. Cf. F. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. I, p. 281. Also, cf. p. 282 on Matt. 7: 21 - Lk. 13: 22 ff.: "But neither in Mark nor in Q are there any passages which identify the Kingdom of God with the Days of the Messiah."

3. A.E. Rawlinson, Gospel according to Mark, p. 130. Swete, however, holds that it has the significance of "the higher life," p. 198. But compare II Enoch 66: 7, 8 for the "just who escape the great judgment." Cf. H. Major, T.W. Manson, and C.J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, who take the phrase "Gehenna" symbolically, yet admit this description as coming from the eschatological passage, Isa. 66: 24, p.123. N.B. In later references to this work the name of the particular author quoted will be given.

Furthermore, the fact that life is equivalent to the Kingdom makes Jesus' whole message of the Kingdom a message of life, which fact may likewise explain why the term 'life' is so infrequently used by Jesus, since it is already implied in his use of the term 'Kingdom.' As in the apocalyptic literature of the second century B.C., with Jesus the judgment precedes the advent of the Kingdom.

Jesus' teaching of the two ways of life¹ seems almost as definitely eschatological as the teaching just considered, especially in the form in which Luke expresses it: "Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able" (Luke 13: 24). Either Matthew is revising the quotation as given in Luke to make it more suitable for didactic purposes in the Sermon on the Mount, or else it is an entirely different saying.² As Allen says, "Here the meaning is less definitely eschatological (than in Luke), but it is not improbable that we should interpret the words in the light of verses 22 ff. with reference to the future kingdom."³ Furthermore, the occurrence

1. Matt. 7: 13, 14: "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many are they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate and straitened with way, that leadeth unto life, and few are they that find it."

2. M.J. Lagrange, Saint Matthieu, p. 150. He believes that there is no revision here by Matthew, but other modern scholars believe that the saying has been thus modified. Cf. Major, Manson and Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 467.

3. W.C. Allen, Matthew, (I C C), p. 68.

of ἀπώλεται (destruction) as opposed to ζωή (life) increases the likelihood that the life referred to comes after the judgment.

The picture of this coming judgment, the designation of the righteous to eternal life and the wicked to everlasting fire, is represented further in detail in the discourse of Matthew 25: 31-46. Some commentators have felt that this description of the king upon the throne who divides the merciful from the unmerciful on the basis of their deeds, comes from a later hand, for as Allen says, "The change from 'Son of man,' v. 31, to 'king' here is very abrupt and unexpected. It appears as if a parable in which 'the king' is the central figure had been adapted to refer to the coming 'Son of man'."¹ While there may be good reason to believe that this passage came from a later hand to comfort the persecuted Christians and to encourage them to stand by one another, nevertheless its origin may have come from Jesus himself in some form, and it may reflect the current eschatology of his time.²

1. W.C. Allen, Matthew, (I C C), p. 265. Cf. also S. Matthews, The Messianic Hope in the New Testament, p. 101.

2. Cf. A.B. Bruce, The Synoptic Gospels, (EGT), p. 304.

The representation pictures the Son of Man - Messiah choosing those who are due to receive eternal life. The principle of selection is the kindness shown His brethren in their distress while on earth. The occasions upon which kindness was shown are markedly similar to the occasions upon which God is represented as having shown kindness to Joseph in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.¹ Of the Messiah's jurisdiction as judge, there is a description in I Enoch, "On that day Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory and shall try their works,"² and again, "For in those days the Elect One shall arise, and He shall choose the righteous and holy from among them."³ This strong similarity of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and of I Enoch to the description given in Matthew 25: 31-46, may have been due to a later hand, but the terms of the eschatological teaching are possibly original with Jesus.

There are two other instances in Luke in which Zoe has reference to the physical life rather than the life of the coming age. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Abraham says to Lazarus, "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime (ζωὴν) receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things."⁴ Here, Zoe is quite obviously

1. Cf. Testament of Joseph, 1: 5, 6.

2. I Enoch 45: 3.

3. Ibid., 51: 5a and 2.

4. Luke 16: 26.

the span of earthly life, implying in itself nothing as to its quality. It may well have been used by Jesus in this sense, since the corresponding Hebrew word □ 7 □ has also this meaning.

The other instance in which Zoe is used is Luke 12: 15, "And he said unto them, Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness for a man's life (ζωή) consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth." This saying is followed by the parable of the farmer who heaped up corn for his own enjoyment. "But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul (ψυχή) required of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be?" This sudden change from Zoe to Psyche, when each seems to have almost the same meaning, would seem to require some explanation. Perhaps a hint lies in Easton's comment on Luke 12: 15, in which he says that "φυλάσσειν and ἐπαρχειν are both 'Lukan,' and this verse has certainly undergone revision of some sort."¹ It may be asked whether in this revision the Zoe may not have taken the place of an original Psyche in this passage. In any case, the meaning

1. B.S. Easton, Commentary on Luke, p. 201. Cf. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 698, where it is suggested that Jesus ~~uses~~ the term ζωή in a transcendent and spiritual sense. But may not Luke have substituted ζωή for ψυχή in order to give it this spiritual significance?

seems to have reference to the physical life which cannot be secured against death by the abundance of possessions.¹

This brief review of Jesus' use of the term Zoe shows that in almost every instance it is consonant with a message that "the kingdom of God is at hand," thus signifying the good news that the new life in the kingdom is approaching. In this sense, God's offer of the coming life in the Kingdom is the motive for immediate repentance and turning with the whole life to Him. Likewise, the life in the Kingdom is in no wise an achievement of man but a pure gift of God.² But in view of the immediacy of this coming event all men are in a state of crisis. John the Baptist had preached the message, Turn from your sins and escape from God's wrath which is about to come.³ Jesus preached, Turn to God and accept life in His Kingdom which is about to come.⁴

1. Cf. Ecclesiasticus 5: 1-3, in which approximately the same idea is asserted.

2. F. von Hügel, Eternal Life, p. 57.

3. Matt. 3: 7-12; Luke 3: 7-17.

4. Matt. 4: 17; Mark 1: 15. Cf. Matt. 9: 13; Mk. 2:17; Luke 5: 31, 32.

LIFE IN THE COMING KINGDOM.

What, then, may we learn from the teaching of Jesus concerning the nature of the life in the coming Kingdom? The references to its exact nature are rather brief and leave us to reconstruct His ideas from other sources. Life in the new age was to follow a judgment, and to be a gift bestowed upon the righteous. A resurrection is assumed by Jesus in which the bodies of the righteous will be transformed so that the marriage relationship will no longer exist, "for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven."¹ The meaning of Jesus is astonishingly clarified by a comparison of his words with the address to the fallen angels in Enoch: "But you were (formerly) spiritual, living the eternal life, and immortal for all of the generations of the world. And therefore have I not appointed wives for you; for as for the spiritual ones of the heaven, in heaven is their dwelling."²

The Jews assumed that survival after death in communion with God necessitated the reuniting of the soul and body.³

1. Matt. 22: 30; Mk. 12: 25; Lk. 20: 35. Reproduction is unnecessary for the continuance of a family line in a society of immortal individuals. Hence there is no place for marriage in the heavenly society.

2. A.E. Rawlinson, St. Mark, p. 168. I Enoch 15: 6, 7.

3. E. Evans, Corinthians, p. 138.

Communion with God in a shadowy soul would have been incomplete. Hence, Jesus' argument for a resurrection of the body on the basis of the unbroken communion of the Patriarchs with God, while not valid for the Greek with his dualism of soul and body, could easily have been valid for the Jew. Jesus seems to disclose some such dualism in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus;¹ and this inference is further supported from the saying in Luke 21: 18, "In your patience ye shall win your souls (ψυχάς)." The Psyche seems to have been the immortal part of man which continues in the life to come. But even then it is exceedingly doubtful whether Jesus thought of this as a personal existence, for, as Guignebert says, "If he had believed that the essential human personality resided in the soul alone, the expectation and preaching of the Kingdom would have been superfluous. The physical transformation of the natural order would have been a dream without a purpose"² The fact is that, in other features apart from marriage, this life is represented as a bodily existence similar to that lived in the present world.³ There will be thrones and ranks in the coming Kingdom, as well as eating and drinking at the banquet table.⁴ Fellowship with Jesus will be the special privilege

1 & 2. C. Guignebert, Jesus, p. 392. Cf. A. Titius, Die N. T. Lehre von der Seligkeit, Pt. I., p. 31. "Jesus had no concept of the life of the soul apart from the body." No true human life without corporeity is represented.

3. Matt. 19: 28; Lk. 18: 29.

4. Matt. 26: 29; Mk. 14: 25; Lk. 22: 18.

of those who have been true to him while he was on the earth. Jesus contrasts this eternal life with the destruction in Gehenna, thus permitting the possible inference that the bliss will be as great for the righteous as the corresponding torture for the wicked. At least, we have evidence for this in the contrast between the light which will constantly shine for those in eternal life, and the darkness of the condemned.¹

The life differs from this earthly life, in that it is completely under the will of God, and only the righteous will participate in it. The term 'Kingdom of God' is seldom found in the literature contemporaneous with the life of Jesus, probably for the reason that the expectation was centered upon a restored Israel. Jesus rejects this expectation, pointing out from the Scriptures that the Messiah could not be of Davidic descent, but was supernaturally ruling over all at the right hand of God.²

"Such a universalizing of the messianic concept does not modify the idea of the kingdom as an eschatological institution, but introduces a fundamental change in the condition of membership in it. It goes far also

1. Matt. 8: 12, 22: 13, 25: 30. However, it remains uncertain whether this is a later revision of Matthew in view of his eschatological interests, or has its actual source in the teaching of Jesus. Only with difficulty can it be determined to what extent Jesus' language is to be taken figuratively: cf. A.C. Zenos, The Plastic Age of the Gospel, p. 38. Nevertheless, with regard to the Kingdom the probability is that he conceived of it in concrete terms, somewhat as his contemporaries did, as God's universal reign in a transformed earth, as in heaven, (Matt. 6: 10 - Lk. 11: 2: I Enoch 58: 3-6; 62: 14). Cf. C. Guignebert, Jesus, p. 392.

2. Matt. 22: 41-46; Mk. 12: 36, 37; Lk. 20: 41-44.

to show that in the teaching of Jesus the most fundamental thing was not the kingdom itself, but that quality of life which assured a participation in its blessings."¹ "Since it was the kingdom of God, it was for God that (one) must be ready."²

Jesus was calling men everywhere to repent for a new life in which God alone would rule, and be everywhere present as Father and Lord. Poverty, hunger, and grief would therefore be forever abolished in this new realm.³

Finally, this life was an everlasting life having the quality of immortality. Death was overcome through the δύναμις of God so that death could no longer reign.⁴ It may be inferred from the healing ministry of Jesus that this same δύναμις would prevent disease and sickness, which were due in the present world to the activity of Satan and his demons.⁵ In the coming world where the power of God will become victorious, these things could no longer exist.

The Parables of Enoch present a more complete picture of this eternal life, hints of which we are able to gather from the teachings of Jesus. While it is true that the Parables may have influenced the gospel writers to introduce details of this life which Jesus himself left indefinite,

1. S. Mathews, The Messianic Hope in the New Testament, p. 112.

2. E. Bosworth, The Life and Teaching of Jesus, p. 150.

3. Luke 6: 20, 21. True, the poor are called 'the pious' in late Judaism, but they are still poor in this world. Cf. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 339.

4. Mark 12: 24 f.

5. Matt. 12: 22-28; Lk. 11: 14-20. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, pp. 41, 42.

they present a picture which approximates the hints revealed in Jesus' teaching:

"And the righteous shall be in the light
of the sun,
And the elect in the light of eternal life:
The days of their life shall be unending,
and the days of the holy without number ..
.....

And after this it shall be said to the
holy in heaven
That they should seek out the secrets
of righteousness, the heritage of
faith:
For it has become bright as the sun
upon the earth,
And the darkness is past.
And there shall be a light that never
endeth,
.....

For the darkness shall first have been
destroyed,
.....

And the light of uprightness established
for ever before the Lord of Spirits."¹
.....

"And the Lord of Spirits will abide over
them,
And with the Son of Man shall they eat
And lie down and rise up for ever and ever."²

To the realization of some such hope in the immediate future, Jesus and his disciples must have been looking. What had Jesus to say of the present life in view of this future event? The use of the term 'Psyche' reveals much of his teaching concerning this.

1. I Enoch 58: 3-6.

2. Ibid., 62: 14.

THE SYNOPTIC OCCURRENCES OF "PSYCHE"

When we turn to the study of the Psyche (life or soul), we find the synoptic passages consistently representing it as a present possession. It is classed among other present possessions, such as house and lands and family (Luke 14:26). A man may heap up goods in this present world to satisfy his Psyche (Lk. 12:15). It is the Psyche which is satisfied by food and drink with which man provides it (Matt. 6:25, Lk. 12:22). Since the Psyche is a man's own present possession, it is within his power to offer it for a cause, (Lk. 21:18, Mk. 8:35 and parallels; Mk. 10:45). These passages all combine to show that the Psyche of man is the principle of his physical and personal existence upon the earth, and is a present possession of which he may dispose as he pleases. Jesus' interpretation, we may judge from these passages, is almost the same as the interpretation of the Nephesh in the Old Testament.

On the other hand, Jesus' teaching has much in it which taken by itself could be almost regarded as Psyche-denying. He strongly opposes those who make its care and its satisfaction the chief aim of their endeavour and classes them with the Pagans (Luke 12:22, 23; Matt. 6:25). Nay, more, following Jesus means to hate the Psyche along with

other earthly possessions and ties. (Lk. 14: 26).¹ Furthermore, the loss of the Psyche, at least the willingness to lose it, is the demand set by Jesus upon his disciples in following him. This is repeatedly attested in the Gospels, occurring five times in the Synoptic Gospels and once in John's.² Jesus' summons to reject the Psyche, to abandon it to hate it, and to refuse to be preoccupied with its welfare, would apparently indicate that he not only set a low estimate upon the Psyche of man, but even regarded it as a positive hindrance to discipleship. Indeed, if the Psyche is classed with houses and lands to be abandoned, it would seem that some manner of world-denying emphasis in the teaching of Jesus can hardly be evaded.

Yet there is the striking paradox, that this same Psyche is valued above the gain of the whole world.³ Jesus' ministry of healing, which occupied such an important part in his work, is described as a ministry of saving the Psyche, and he puts the saving of the Psyche above the current Sabbath laws.⁴ The promise given those who endure

1. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 423, point out that 'hate' here must be taken in the relative sense of 'love less.' In the instance quoted from the Talmud, it has the sense of rejecting the lesser in favor of the greater good, the same as here.

2. Matt. 10: 39, 16: 25 f.; Mark 8: 35 f.; Luke 9: 24 f., 17: 33.

3. Mt. 16: 26; Mk. 8: 36; Lk. 9: 25.

4. Mark 3: 4; Lk. 6: 9.

persecution is that they will thereby save the Psyche.¹

The paradox is not only apparent from the comparison of these passages, but it is explicitly stated by Jesus repeatedly. "For whosoever wills to save his life (Psyche), shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life (Psyche) for my sake, shall find it. For what shall a man be profited if he should gain the whole world, but lose his Psyche; or what shall a man give in exchange for his Psyche."² The solution of this paradox would probably mean the solution of the whole paradox in Jesus' teaching about the Psyche.

Various solutions have been offered to fit in with modern psychological theories. One psychologist describes it as follows: "The more a person tries to preserve his own personality (his ego), the more he tries to avoid the abyss and to reach plus 100, by this very striving he is led into the abyss. The more he faces death, the abyss, this point which to him is worse than death, the more he finds the courage to go through it."³ Another would describe the saying as representing that the "sacrifice of immediate desires and inclinations" for the sake of "a set of values

1. Lk. 21: 18.

2. Matt. 16: 25, 26. Mark's "and the gospel's" (9: 24) does not occur either in Matthew or Luke. In each of these latter instances, the losing of the life is simply for Jesus' sake.

3. F. Künkel, Lectures on the We-Psychology at Holmby College, Los Angeles, California, p. 100.

which transcend the values of the individual" leads "to a fuller life, not a sterile life."¹ A somewhat similar interpretation of the paradox is offered in a modern commentary. Of Mark 9: 43-45 which speaks of the members of the body being sacrificed in order to enter into life, this commentary says: "Jesus speaks of that quality of life which is reached along the road of discipline and sacrifice." Of the particular passage under consideration (of losing one's life to find it), this commentary says: "Jesus speaks of that true life which only comes through the sacrifice of material interests."² Yet, when treating of this latter passage in its context, it says, "To save one's life at the cost of treachery to Jesus and His mission is to lose it; and to sacrifice one's life in the service of the Kingdom of God is to save it."³

The parallels in Rabbinic literature are more or less similar, but do not contain quite the same emphasis, as they do not have the same context. An interesting saying is the one which runs as follows: "That is the right study of the Torah when a man dies in the keeping of the Torah."⁴ The

1. H.C. Link, The Return to Religion, p. 33.

2. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 698. Cf. H.B. Swete, St. Mark, p. 172, for the interpretation that a higher and lower life are meant.

3. Ibid., p. 437.

4. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. I, p. 588. See also for other parallels to be compared with this. The date of this saying is about 250 A.D., yet it undoubtedly reflects an earlier attitude.

history of the Jews indicates how often the keeping of the Torah involved such a losing of the life. However, more in conformity with the interpretations offered above are the words of Hillel (20 B.C.): "He who seeks a great name, may bring the opposite to pass."¹

The most obvious meaning of the text when taken in each instance in its context, is that which Montefiore gives it, "He who finds martyrdom in this life will live again in the world to come, or in the Kingdom of God. He who avoids martyrdom, and thus saves his life in this world, will lose it in the next world It does not mean that to gain the higher life we must forego the lower life."² Some may incline to doubt this interpretation in view of the previous verse, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Mark 8: 34). Could such a mention of a cross take place only after the crucifixion? Perhaps, if crucifixions were previously unknown. But, as Swete says, "Such wholesale crucifixions had occurred within memory (Schürer, II, 1, p. 5) and might be expected in case of revolt."³ There was no certainty

1. Ibid., p. 588.

2. C.G. Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, Vol. I., p. 197.

3. H.B. Swete, St. Mark, p. 182.

that Jesus' movement might not end in the same fashion as another Messianic revolt. Yet martyrdom would not mean loss, it would mean gain. Just as the surrender of possessions in behalf of these 'pious poor' would store up for one treasure in heaven, so, too, the surrender of life in behalf of the Kingdom of God would mean the gain of life in the coming Kingdom. There was no possible defeat for him on whose side God stood. To be against God is the only ultimate defeat, the only reason for fear. "And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both Psyche and body in Gehenna."¹

On the other hand, to stand for God, on His side, in anticipating the coming Kingdom, means to be without anxiety about the Psyche. God is Lord of His world. If He is Lord of His own in case of the lilies, and the birds, then why not of His own children of the Kingdom in providing for them the necessities of life?² Therefore, as Montefiore says, "The disciples and those who are preparing themselves for the coming Kingdom must not only not 'serve' riches, but they must not have any care or concern for the ordinary

1. Matt. 10: 28; cf. Luke 12: 4.

2. Matt. 6: 25 ff.; Lk. 12: 22 ff.

material needs of life."¹ This may put the matter in the extreme, yet it conveys what truly lies at the heart of the freedom from care. And it furthermore makes this important distinction: these words are addressed not to mankind in general but those preparing for the Kingdom. The promise of Jesus, "Howbeit seek ye his kingdom, and these things shall be added unto you"² - offers freedom from anxiety to those who have decided for God and the Kingdom, and not to all indiscriminately. The repentance which involved the will to abandon all for the Kingdom of God, involves on God's side the will to take care of His own so that the life wholly under the will of God is already undefeated by the world.³ In a certain sense, God's reign is present already in the interval before the coming of the Kingdom of God.

"When, then, He (Jesus) speaks of the Kingdom as yet to be, the futurity is never a denial of its present existence His usual method is to link up intimately life in the Kingdom here with life in the Kingdom hereafter. Thus, when he is speaking of those who will or will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven in the future, his mind works from what now is; it is almost as if the community was got together here, and was removed with its present membership into the Hereafter"⁴

Nevertheless, life in this present world order cannot be the same, even for those who are members of the Kingdom,

1. C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, (1909), Vol. II, p. 542.

2. Luke 12: 31; cf. Matt. 6: 33.

3. H. Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, Vol. I, p. 251.

4. T. Walker, Jesus and Jewish Teaching, pp. 104-105.

as life in the future Kingdom. Even if the disciple is to receive a hundredfold more than he gives up in the present age, he will also meet persecutions.¹ Persecutions, however, are not to be dreaded but welcomed, in view of the similar treatment which the prophets received in their generation, and in view of the reward promised in heaven to those who endure it to the end.² But while the actual conditions for joy are not present, Jesus calls upon his disciples to rejoice in persecution now in anticipation of the reward to come. Such human tragedy is a heavenly victory. Far from inducing his disciples to escape the reality of the world by presenting the fanciful image of a world to come, Jesus inspires his disciples to meet the world with the worst it can offer, even death, -- to meet it triumphantly and joyously, assured of God's final vindication of His righteous. The ethic of Jesus is therefore related to this final consummation, because it is from one point of view the instruction which he gave his disciples on how to act in the world now in view of the coming Kingdom. This is amply indicated in the words with which Jesus opens the

1. Mk. 10: 29, 30; Mat. 19: 29; Lk. 18: 29, 30.

2. Matt. 5: 11, 12 - Lk. 6: 22, 23.

the Sermon on the Mount:

"Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the Kingdom of
God.
Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be
filled.
Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh."
(Lk. 6: 20-21.)

These words significantly open Jesus' discourse on righteousness.¹

DID JESUS TEACH AN INTERIM ETHIC?

The question of interim ethic naturally arises in view of the above considerations. While the ethic of Jesus would require volumes to treat it adequately, a brief treatment here is demanded because of its bearing on the relation of the present to the future life. The question pushes beyond, What is this ethic of Jesus? to, Why is it this kind of ethic? If the present life is related to the future, this relationship hinges on the interpretation of righteousness. This was not only recognized by Jesus, but also by many Jewish rabbis. To receive God's Kingdom meant also to receive His decrees.² To die in performing the law assured

1. Cf. T.W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 339: "This Q form is probably preserved in Luke 6: 20-49."

2. S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, p.116.

one a place in "the world which is all good."¹ And even in the content and specific injunctions of Jesus' ethic not only can a Jewish scholar say that "throughout the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be paralleled either in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, or in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus,"² but there is also agreement with this from the Christian side.³

Various interpretations occur as to the ground of Jesus' ethic. One liberal thinker has said, "When one reviews the ethical teaching in Mark, he finds that Jesus' message involved the ethical faith in the moral trend of the universe ..."⁴ Another has said that Jesus was substituting an ethic of intention and will for that of the act, that wherever the "Law and tradition seemed to him to be opposed to that which he regarded as the direct revelation of God to his own soul, he rejected them." He differentiates between the Old Testament as a collection of oracles, and the Old Testament as the Word of God "addressed

1. I. Abrahams, Pharisaism and the Gospels, First Series, p. vii.

2. J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 384.

3. C. Guignebert, Jesus, p. 387; cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. II, pp. 85 ff.; M. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p. 553.

4. H.C. King, The Ethics of Jesus, p. 143. Cf. C. Gore, The Sermon on the Mount, p. 52.

to the conscience."¹ A third argues that "Jesus has no ethics, if we are to understand by the term a reasoned, systematic code of morals, drawn up with a definite view to its application to the needs of daily life. The teaching of Jesus had no temporary or specific orientation to the present world order." He goes on to state that its purpose is to place man in a position of detachment from this life and whole-hearted concern with that life whose condition is completely absolved from the claims and conditions of this life. Jesus' eschatological preoccupation explains the impossible demands made by his law of love.²

These views represent the different extremes to be found among modern scholars in their effort to determine what is original and basic in the ethical teaching of Jesus. A host of other interpretations might also be found, some of which vary from each other as widely as these. However, two extremes are usually to be found in any treatment of the ethic of Jesus. According to the one, the ethic is treated as if it contained the whole of Jesus' teaching about life. In the other, the ethic is scarcely recognized as valid in any real or permanent sense at all, and is purely incidental

1. M. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p. 554.

2. C. Guignebert, Jesus, p. 387.

to the preaching of the coming Kingdom which is the only valid reality which Jesus sets before men. In the former sense, the Sermon on the Mount is regarded as the Law of the Kingdom. Each of these views neglects important phases of the other. Why did Jesus begin the discourse known as the Sermon on the Mount with a series of blessings of the coming Kingdom unless the Kingdom had some relation to the ethic he was about to proclaim? Yet, on the other hand, why did Jesus concern himself so extensively about right conduct in the affairs of this world if he was exclusively occupied with the coming age? For the ethic of Jesus concerns itself with life in this age, not in the age to come;¹ there could not possibly be the problems of forgiving one's enemies, or of anger, or of lust, in the coming age. Every exhortation is intimately related to some situation in the present world. There is nothing temporary about the implication of the words of Jesus, "Every one therefore which heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man, which built his house upon the rock."² Abrahams has seen clearly the false thinking on the part of Christian scholars who find the ethical teaching of Jesus

1. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 48.

2. Matt. 7: 24 ff. - Lk. 6: 47 ff.

irreconcilable with his eschatology, for, as he points out, "the Jew sees nothing inconsistent in these two aspects."¹ The strong ethical trend shown in the apocalyptic Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs indicates how in Jewish thinking the two went hand in hand.

As has been indicated, almost all of the content of Jesus' teaching can be shown to come from Jewish sources, in the opinion of many investigators. Furthermore, the centrality of certain injunctions and the stress on inwardness in keeping the Law appear in Jewish writings. Jewish Rabbis also set certain laws such as love of one's neighbour as the most comprehensive in the Law,² so that love of God and love of one's neighbour had already been put together as a summary of the Law.³ And, as for the inner spirit of the law being emphasised, greater stress on it could hardly be placed than is to be found in the words: "Love ye one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold no guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him."⁴

The solution to the whole problem presented in the ethic of Jesus ought not to be derived too hastily, as if

1. I. Abrahams, Pharisaism and the Gospels, First Series, p. vii.

2. G.F. Moore, Judaism, p. 85 ff.

3. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Dan. 5: 1-3.

4. Ibid., Gad 6: 3. For purity of the eye, cf. Mekilta de R. Simeon ben Yokai, on Exodus 20: 14.

the Gordian knot which has not been wholly unloosed in nineteen hundred years should suddenly come unravelled with a few turns. The unravelling of his ethic must take place in the total context of his teaching. When taken in the total context of his teaching Jesus' ethic is mainly devoted to opening the deeper aspects of his message of repentance.¹ Repentance is his chief concern, not the nature of the coming Kingdom. Everywhere in his teaching we find the greatest concern about what man ought to do, but the nature and seasons of the future events are left to God.² What man is to do now is very specifically set forth, and every form of argument is used to persuade men that the change which they make, is not to be left to the future but must be made now.³

This change which is to be made now in the present world order is primarily as a change of the will, the seat of human action.⁴ To the Jew, the religious question was not a speculative one about the existence of God. Disbelief was disobedience, disregarding God's Word, and either violating or neglecting His commandments. Not until Philo did the philosophical questions about God concern the Jew. As

1. E.F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, p. 118.

2. Mark 13: 32 - Mat. 24: 36, Lk. 11: 29.

3. Matt. 21: 28-32; 22: 1-14; 25: 1-13. Mark 13: 34, 35. Luke 12: 16-21, 35-40; 16: 19-31; 19: 12-27.

4. H.F. Rall, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 76-77.

Moore with characteristic insight remarks, "Jewish monotheism was reached through the belief that the will of God for righteousness is supreme in the history of the world."¹ With this, Jesus seems fundamentally to have agreed. But his disagreement with the Jew who held that the Torah was the sum total and infallibly revealed will of God is shown in his use of the Old Testament. He even dared to oppose the Old Testament as a formal legal authority for presenting the will of God, for Jesus would not agree that God's will is stated by an external authority.² Yet it would seem to be straining the liberty which Jesus implies for man, to say that "man is trusted and expected to see for himself what God commands. God's requirements are intrinsically intelligible."³

Where are the requirements of God intelligible if not in the Torah? Jesus seems to answer that they are only intelligible from the character of God. He goes behind the Torah to Him who has given it.⁴ He faces man, not with the Torah, nor with an ideal ethic of the coming Kingdom, but with God Himself. At the supreme point, in his ethic of love Jesus summarizes: "But love your enemies, and do them

1. G.F. Moore, Judaism, Vol. I, p. 361.

2. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, pp. 76-77.

3. Ibid., p. 77.

4. Cf. F. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Vol. I., pp. 293-294.

good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High: for He is kind toward the unthankful and evil. Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful,"¹ or as Matthew puts it, "Ye therefore shall be perfect (τέλειοι), as your heavenly Father is perfect (τέλειος)."² But this is not simply a matter of imitation, it is an encounter between God and man of the most personal kind. Man meets God as son, with nothing held back, every area of the personality open for God to claim. "He (Jesus) speaks of God in speaking of man and showing Him that He stands in the last hour of decision, that His will is claimed by God."³ There is therefore not only Godlikeness in the quality of love demanded, which gives and forgives,⁴ but also childlikeness in trust and obedience. Far from its being submission to an absolute tyrant, this obedience rests on a trust in an all good Father.⁵ This attitude toward God has its immediate counterpart in a corresponding active goodwill toward

1. Luke 6: 35 f.

2. Matt. 5: 48.

3. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 152.

4. J. Moffatt, Love in the New Testament, p. 67.

5. Matt. 7: 7-11 - Luke 11: 9-13.

men, for God's goodness generates a corresponding goodness on the part of men toward one another. For this reason, although the saying of Jesus known as the Golden Rule occurs in different contexts in Matthew and Luke, in each instance it is linked with the goodness of God.¹

The idea of this intimate, first-hand knowledge of God is made possible for Jesus by his conception of the character of God.² Bultmann has grasped Jesus' idea of God so clearly as to make his words in this regard worth quoting:

"It is not that Jesus distinguishes between a remote, mysterious, metaphysical nature of God, and God's dealing with us as the expression of this nature; rather the remote and the near God are one. It is impossible to speak of God in Jesus' sense without speaking of His activity. As with man, in Jesus' sense, there can be no distinction between his nature and his actions which are the result of his nature, but the actual essence of man is present in action, likewise God is present when He is active."³

Since God is revealed through activity, it is to the will that Jesus looks for the link between man and God. Man knows God, not simply by reasoning from the activity of God to His nature, but by acting according to the will

1. Matt. 7: 7-12; Lk. 6: 30-36. Cf. H. Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, Vol. I, p. 329.

2. The term 'character' is of Greek origin and is unknown to the Hebrew language. However, this need not preclude its idea as the sum of the moral attributes of God, derived from His ways of working.

3. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 151. Yet God is not to be identified with the activity itself. N.B. The underscoring of the closing sentence is not Professor Bultmann's.

revealed in His activity. But Jesus points out that the same activity of God which is taking place outside of man in the care of the ravens and lillies of the fields, also takes place within man himself. Man is not to live by analogy: he is to live in trust, conscious that God is active with respect to him in every situation as well as to the rest of nature.¹ God is present at each act, not looking from without, but from within the man, in the giving of alms, in prayer, and in fasting.² Indeed, the reign of God with men is already present,³ laying its claim upon the whole heart and will, whence comes the whole active life of man.⁴ Man acts as the instrument of God. This is also the basis of the new brotherhood with Jesus.⁵

Finally, Jesus stresses the fact that this decision with which man is faced when he unreservedly meets God and discovers His reign here as well as in the Kingdom about to come -- this is a decision between life and death. The decision between life and death is ultimately a moral decision.⁶ It hinges on the question of right and wrong, righteousness

1. Matt. 6: 25-33 - Luke 12: 22-31.

2. Matt. 6: 1-18.

3. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 48.

4. Mark 7: 20 ff.

5. Ibid., 3: 35.

6. C.A. Scott, New Testament Ethics, p. 30.

and wickedness, holiness and sinfulness. That is the issue of life, here as well as hereafter. That was seen to be the issue in Jesus' own life. The Lukan saying, "Man shall not live by bread alone" implies Matthew's addition of the rest of the quotation from Deuteronomy, "but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Obedience to God is the life of man.¹

In this brief survey of the ethic of Jesus, it becomes apparent that righteousness as a condition for entrance into the coming Kingdom has a radically distinctive character, despite the seeming likenesses to contemporaneous interpretations. The righteousness of which Jesus spoke is based upon an attitude with relation to God which is beyond codification, if not actually opposed to it. Furthermore, since this righteousness consists in God's absolute sovereignty in the life of the repentant, it may imply not only a preparation for the coming Kingdom, but the Kingdom's actual beginning in God's dominion over the lives of men. Although this beginning takes place in a world order which is not yet transformed, a new life under the power and dominion of God is already in operation in the lives of the true disciples of Jesus.

1. Cf. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 335-336.

LIFE AS EQUIVALENT TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

While the ethic of Jesus (if ethic can be rightly applied to his teaching on righteousness) involves a decision and acceptance of God's will for oneself, and is a decision for ζωή αἰώνιος (eternal life), this changed life under the will of God is nowhere designated by this term by Jesus. As has been shown above in the discussion of Zoe, the evidence seems to indicate that "'eternal life' is not primarily an ethical or spiritual possession, but the life, unexperienced as yet, which belongs to the coming era (αἰών)."¹ Jesus' relation to eternal life would thus be purely predictive.

However, not all of the evidence is to be drawn from the occurrences of Zoe (life), and ζωή αἰώνιος (eternal life) and the use of these terms in the Synoptic Gospels. The synonymous use of the term 'life' for 'the Kingdom of God' indicates that Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God is also about eternal life.² "To enter the Kingdom of God, and to enter into life, are interchangeable terms. As their antithesis there is the phrase: 'to be cast into

1. W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, p. 49, in which the apocalyptic view of Jesus' teaching is described.

2. F. F. Scott, The Kingdom of God, p. 93. Mk. 9:43-48. Matt. 18: 8,9.

Gehenna or into eternal fire'"¹ In a real sense, therefore, the new life of the disciple begins with the coming of the Kingdom. The new Kingdom must bring the new life with it. If it can be determined that the Kingdom of God is represented by Jesus as being already present in some form, then the inference may be assumed that the new life is likewise present in the members of the Kingdom.

One prominent aspect of Jesus' teaching must further be observed to prevent overlooking certain important features of his teaching about the Kingdom of God. The teaching of Jesus according to Mark is in a large measure the outcome of a series of encounters between himself and the Pharisees or others either antagonistic or interested, to whose criticisms or queries he directs pointed replies. His message is thereby intimately related to his activity and person. It does not draw to its climax in logical sequence but in a series of conflicts which culminate in the cross.² Inasmuch as inferences are required to complete the numerous gaps, we cannot rely exclusively on the explicit sayings of Jesus for his teaching.

1. M. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p.565.

2. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, p. 50.

An instance of this kind occurs when John the Baptist sends his messengers to Jesus. Jesus points to his deeds for an answer to the query whether he was 'the coming one,' "Go your way and tell John which things ye do hear and see."¹ There is some controversy as to whether the following passage which Jesus quotes from Isaiah 61:1 and 35:5 concerning the blind receiving sight, the lame, deaf, and leprous being healed, and the dead being raised is meant literally or allegorically. While it is obviously intended in Matthew and Luke that the passage should be taken literally, "perhaps this was not intended in Q. The words are derived from Isaiah 61:1 combined with 35:5f. where they are figurative expressions for the bestowal of new life."² Easton admits that there are several scholars such as Loisy, Wellhausen, and Holtzmann, who interpret the passage allegorically. He thinks it is hardly credible that it was so meant originally, for not even the passages quoted from Isaiah were meant to be taken wholly allegorically. "Allegory is not to be excluded entirely, but it does not exhaust the meaning of the passage. Christ did not regard healing a primary part of

1. Matt. 11:4 - Lk. 7:22.

2. J. M. Creed, Luke, p. 106. Matt. 11:4-5 - Lk. 7:22.

His commission, but the cures when they occurred bore Him real testimony."¹ To deny that this reply to John's disciples could have any relation to the healing ministry of Jesus would seem to involve one in difficulties, unless the fact that Jesus performed healing wonders is denied. The argument that the prophet from whom Jesus is quoting meant his words to be taken allegorically - and therefore Jesus meant the words allegorically, is scarcely a conclusive one in view of the wide divergence between Rabbinic interpretations of the Old Testament and the interpretation which the Old Testament writers obviously intended. Similar instances of freedom of interpretation also occur with Jesus.² Furthermore, the healing as well as the teaching ministry was designed to elicit faith;³ and indeed the two went hand in hand.⁴

The answer of Jesus to the Baptist's query has enough significance to make its interpretation important, since in it Jesus is making a declaration about the coming Kingdom and himself in relation to it. Due to the fact that

1. B. S. Easton, Luke, p.101. With this Plummer, Harnack, Otto, and C.H. Dodd agree.

2. Mk. 12:26 ff; 12:35 ff.

3. Mk. 5:25-36, 7:24-30, etc.

4. Matt. 13:54-58, - Mk. 6:1-6.

contemporaneous expectation looked for the sickness and death which came with Adam's fall to be abolished in the Messianic age,¹ Jesus' declaration, interpreted as relating to his own healing ministry, is an announcement that the beginning of the Messianic age is already present in these Messianic manifestations. Already he is "setting forth the power of the kingdom by his overcoming the misery that argued the presence of the 'kingdom' of Satan."² It is in this sense that Jesus declared that the Kingdom is already present;³ and in this sense the manifestation of the power which brings life in the coming Kingdom is already present. This life-giving aspect to Jesus' ministry shows that the Kingdom is already having its beginnings with him on earth.

These cures of Jesus were regarded by him as effecting release from the powers of Satan by means of the power and spirit of God. That is the meaning of Jesus' use of Isaiah 61:1f. as a proclamation of release to captives, when he returns to Nazareth to give his Messianic message.⁴ Luke rightly points out in his account of Jesus' return to

1. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. I., p. 593.

2. E. Burton, S. Mathews, The Life of Christ, p. 214.

3. C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, p. 50.

4. Luke 4:18. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 296.

Nazareth that the reason for his rejection from his native city is his Messianic message, although this is strangely omitted in the Markan account.¹ This explains why Jesus could be accepted as a wonder-worker and a propounder of wisdom but not as one who brought the new era.. But Jesus was no mere exorcist for he said, "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon (ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) you".² The supernatural triumph of God over Satan which would bring in the Kingdom has already begun. The domination of Satan and his demons in the world is already breaking. The stronger man had broken into the dominion of Satan and was despoiling him in his realms.³ Satan and his demons who were the cause of the torments, disease, and death of men were met with an authority and power to give life which was greater than his to bring death.

Wherein, then, lies the presence of the Kingdom? Rudolph Otto has probably made the most brilliant contribution to the solution of this problem within recent years. He shows that the Kingdom of God is present as the inbreaking eschaton in "dunamis" (power).⁴ In this sense, the sphere

1. Mk. 6:1-6, - Matt. 13:54-58. Cf. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 81.

2. Matt. 12:28 - Lk. 11:19.

3. Matt. 12:29 - Lk. 11:21,22.

4. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 286.

of God's sovereign rule (Königherrschaftsbereich)¹ is already present in and exhibited by the works of His Spirit.² When Jesus bears testimony to himself, it is only as a medium of this Spirit of God. He makes it plain that only blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is beyond forgiveness.³ Blasphemy against men or even the Son of Man is not to be so regarded. But that Jesus is only the medium through which this power was at work is shown in the manner that this power was dispensed through him. It was dispensed only to those who had faith, and was indeed dependent upon the faith of those who sought to be cured. Surely this is the meaning of such expressions, "Believest thou that I am able to do this?" and then, "Be it done to you according to your faith" (Matt. 9:28,29), or, "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace and be whole of thy plague." (Mark 5:34), etc. His power to do mighty works could be crippled by unbelief as is shown in the account of his works at Nazareth, "And he could there do no mighty work (*δύναμις*) save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them. And he marvelled because

1. Ibid., p. 40.

2. Matt. 12: 28 - Lk. 11: 19.

3. Matt. 12: 31,32; Mk. 3: 28, 29; Lk. 12: 10. Cf. T. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 401.

of their unbelief."¹ There is a possible inference in the words of Luke, "and the power of the Lord was with him to heal" (5:17), that the power to heal was sometimes present and sometimes absent, or at least varyingly stronger and weaker.² As Jackson and Lake rightly indicate, in speaking of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus at baptism, "Jesus was conscious of becoming possessed of some power external to Himself which He identified with the Spirit of God. It was by this he wrought his wonderful cures and triumphed over the demons of disease and madness."³ The Spirit is primarily God's Spirit and belongs to Jesus only inasmuch as God has chosen him for its bestowal. According to the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, the power is not only Jesus' own but he is able to bestow it upon his disciples by giving them authority (ἐξουσία) over unclean spirits. As Satan gives authority to his agents and has his hierarchy of powers, so God has his hierarchy, and authority can be given by Jesus, the chosen one, over unclean spirits. For this reason Jesus was accused by his

1. Mk. 6:5,6 - Matt. 13:58: - this has changed the wording so as to indicate that Jesus refused to do the mighty work of his won accord because of their unbelief.

2. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 294.

3. F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 287 f.

opponents of casting out demons by the prince of the devils, since it was probably believed that such a hierarchy of demons existed.¹ But instead it is affirmed he has assumed authority for himself and his disciples in waging the warfare against Satan and ushering in the reign of God over men by casting out demons.² However, from the words of Jesus himself it seems apparent that he chiefly regarded the disciples' own faith as the means of their receiving the wonderworking power (Mt. 17:19 - Lk. 17:6, Mt. 21:21). Nevertheless, with these events in mind, Jesus could say to the Pharisees who thought they could calculate the event, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within (in the midst of ἐντός) you."³

It is in the parables that Jesus actually develops this present dynamic aspect of the Kingdom by introducing into the old beliefs this new aspect of what Dodd calls

1. Matt. 12:24 - Mk. 3:22 - Lk. 11:15. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 68.

2. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 108; but E. F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, p. 114, says that Jesus connects his power less with Himself than with the new age about to dawn. Jesus assumes the same powers for the disciples if they have faith by which they, too, attest the coming age.

3. Ibid., p. 106 ff., where other theories are presented in some detail, Lk. 17:20 - 21.

"realized eschatology." In them, he points men to the presence of the Kingdom in the "impact upon this world of the 'powers of the world to come.'"¹ Such an interpretation of the Kingdom required parables to explain it and to meet the growing opposition to it. As is evident in the Beelzebub scene, the coming of the Kingdom in Jesus' acts of healing is the point at which he came into conflict with the Pharisees.² They could not conceive of the coming of the Kingdom in that fashion. And indeed, even John the Baptist was sufficiently puzzled so that Jesus, in sending his disciples back to him, says, "And blessed is he, whosoever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me" (Matt. 11:6). Because this teaching about the presence of the Kingdom in power was new and therefore distasteful, Jesus found the parable a convenient method of bringing this message to the people.³ A similar instance occurs in Nathan's use of a parable to point out an unpleasant truth to David.⁴ The parables also may be expected to find their application in concrete situations in Jesus'

1. C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, p. 50.

2. Mk. 3:22 ff.

3. A. Cadoux, The Parables of Jesus, p. 56.

4. II Sam. 12:1 ff.

work.¹ They usually have a single point which finds its incidence in some circumstance by which it originated. Parables are therefore not allegories, although in some instances they may have certain allegorical features. Obviously Jesus did not intend to portray God as an unrighteous judge² or set as an example the unjust steward.³ Care must therefore be used in ascertaining the purpose and point of the parable if it is to be properly interpreted.

Using these brief hints in the interpretation of the parables, the first matter of concern is to find what the occasion was which produced the parables. This has already been defined in the total teaching of Jesus in the words, "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel."⁴ It has been indicated furthermore that while Jesus shared, in a measure, in the apocalyptic view of the coming of the Kingdom, the point of his preaching was the change to be wrought immediately in man's repentance. John had said, "Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance"⁵ The fruits

1. A. Cadoux, The Parables of Jesus, p. 54 f.

2. Luke 18:1-8.

3. Luke 16:1-13.

4. Mk. 1:15.

5. Lk. 3:8; Matt. 3:8.

had consisted in a change of moral conduct.¹ Jesus had also said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." "For there is no good tree that bringeth forth corrupt fruit; nor again a corrupt tree that bringeth forth good fruit. For each tree is known by its own fruit."² The fruits (καρποί) were therefore quite as important for Jesus in his message of repentance, as for John the Baptist. Not what a man says but what he does will count in the final reckoning.³ But Jesus' idea of repentance differed from John's, and this he sought to elucidate by example and parable.

One point of difference is unfolded in the parables of the Pearl of Great Price and the Treasure Hidden in a Field.⁴ Men turn to God, not because of the wrath to come but because of the good thing He has in store for them.

Furthermore, John seems to have held that baptism was the divinely appointed seal of repentance and remission of sins, in preparation for the coming judgment, and made it the substance of his preaching;⁵ but Jesus holds that

1. Lk. 3:10 ff.

2. Matt. 7:20; cf. Lk. 6:43, 44.

3. Matt. 7:21; Lk. 6:46.

4. Matt. 13:44, 45.

5. Mk. 1:4 - Lk. 3:3.

the authority (ἐξουσία) of the Word which he proclaims and of which he himself is the mediator is the seal of membership in the Kingdom. John said, "repent and be baptized." Jesus said, "Repent and believe the gospel."¹ Jesus declares that the selection and rejection for the coming judgment are already taking place by the reception given his words. The wise hear and heed; the foolish hear but disregard them.² Of the validity of his word in relation to the coming Kingdom, Jesus says, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away."³ These words probably have an even wider validity than in relation to the consummation, in which context they are found.⁴ Furthermore, he declares the forgiveness of sins with an authority which manifests itself in the power to heal a man sick of the palsy.⁵ The Word absolves and makes men whole from sin. It is, in fact, in the Word that the 'dunamis' with its healing power is effective through faith. Thus, the centurion who seeks Jesus that his servant might be healed is commended by Jesus because

1. Ibid., Mk. 4:15.

2. Matt. 7:24-27 - Lk. 6:47-49.

3. Mk. 13-31 - Lk. 21:33.

4. T. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 626.

5. Mk. 2:9-11.

he recognizes that Jesus is under authority (presumably of God) and speaks with divine authority.¹

Therefore, when the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower begins, "The sower soweth the word," it has a real affinity to the purpose and circumstances of Jesus' activity.² Nor is it unrelated to the Kingdom, for Jesus attests to the disciples of John, not only from his miracles of healing, but also from the preaching of the gospel, that the Messianic age is dawning.³ But why is the preaching of the Word so ineffective in producing repentance? Jesus answers that although in some instances it is ineffective, in others it is producing amazing fruits. The process of selection for the Kingdom is already in operation in this reception of the Word. As Isaiah also had said, God's word is not void when He calls men to repentance," but it shall accomplish that which (God) pleases, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto (God) sent it" (Isa 55: 10, 11), so with Jesus, the Word is effectual and dynamic in effecting repentance. Oscar Holtzmann even goes so far as to assert,

1. Cf. Matt. 8: 8-10, 13 - Luke 7: 1-10; cf. Matt. 11: 27 - Lk. 10: 21, 22. This much disputed passage of Q, while held in question, has much to support it in other contexts, such as those quoted above.

2. H. Major seems to accept the interpretation as Jesus' own explanation, though he recognizes that other such cases are probably not, Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 69.

3. Matt. 11: 4-6 - Lk. 7: 22, 23. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 42.

"Jesus believes, therefore, that through the effect of his words so happy a change is accomplished in the inner life of a man, that thenceforth he can live fully content in the present as though he were in the kingdom of God already."¹

This special miraculous effect of the Word, utterly dependent upon God's act is further defined in the parable of the seed growing secretly.² According to the current belief, the seed is fruitful only because God makes it fruitful and gives to it a body.³ It is to this miracle of the growing seed that Jesus draws the attention of his hearers, as he describes the farmer looking on it, springing up and growing, "he knoweth not how first the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear" (Mk. 4: 26 ff.) Jesus is showing that the power of God is not only manifested in the judgment, but is manifest here in the repentance wrought through the preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom, The beginnings of the new life are already present in repentance as well as in exorcism and healing.⁴

The parables of the leaven and mustard seed are

1. O. Holtzmann, The Life of Jesus, p. 257; cf. S. Goebel, The Parables of Jesus, p. 88.

2. K.L. Schmidt, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., Lief. 9-10, p. 586.

3. I Cor. 15: 36-38. Cf. I Clement 24: 5.

4. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, pp. 44, 286, 296.

probably of a similar nature.¹ The one emphasizes the inner potency of the Word, the other the contrast between the small beginning and the great ending. Certainly the promises and the proximity of the Kingdom set forth by Jesus must have appeared absurd when Rome was seen hovering over Israel, when previous Messianic movements had gone to nought, when even Jesus' own movement was opposed within the most influential circles of Judaism. But it is like a grain of mustard seed, the least of all the seeds, which grows into a tree so that the birds of the air rest in its branches, according to the symbol which in Daniel indicates world dominion.² The potency of this divine power when permitted to work through faith is expressed by Jesus in another parable of the mustard seed, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."³ The feebleness of man's part in bringing the Kingdom in proportion to God's part is again illustrated here. The Kingdom as an inner

1. Matt. 13: 31-33 - Lk. 13: 18-21; Mk. 4: 30-32.

2. Dan. 4: 9-22. Cf. T.W. Manson, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 133, Note 1.

3. Matt. 17: 20; cf. Lk. 17: 6.

transformation is also expressed in the parable of the leaven. Again the matter of inner potency is stressed, and also the contrast between the small agency and the great result.¹

In these parables of growth, therefore, Jesus reveals that the Kingdom with its life is already secretly, inwardly present as the power of God in His message, transforming and renewing men's lives. He does not deny the coming Kingdom which will arrive in outward, visible form, whereby that "which is hid" shall "be made manifest."² But that same power which will bring the outward transformation,³ is already present bringing an inner transformation;⁴ the same sovereign rule which will have its sway in the coming Kingdom, claims its own over men and demons now.⁵ Jesus regards his parables as revealing the secret, inner aspect of the Kingdom, the mystery of which is revealed to the eyes of faith but hidden to others outside of the Kingdom.⁶ The Kingdom, which is present in its beginnings in secret, is the same as that which will be present in glory at its consummation. Eternal life, the gift of God, has already its

1. T. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 415.

2. Mk. 4: 21, 22; Lk. 8: 17, 12: 1 ff.

3. Mark, 13: 26.

4. Lk. 4: 18 ff.

5. Matt. 12: 28 - Lk. 11: 20; Matt. 6: 24 ff. Cf. Lk. 16: 1-13.

6. Mk. 4: 11, 12. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, pp. 110-111; also H. Major, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 70.

beginnings in the repentance wrought through the gift of God's power in the Word.

But Jesus also indicates in his direct teaching, that those who are unrepentant are already 'dead.' To the request of one whom Jesus had summoned to follow him that permission be granted first to bury the father, Jesus replies, "Follow me, and let the dead bury their own dead."¹ McNeile believes that Jesus probably has reference to an Aramaic proverb, "Let the dead past bury its dead," or that it is a possible misreading of the Aramaic ..² Another suggests that the man's father may have been still alive.³ However, such opinions are rather hypothetical and do not carry weight with most modern scholars.⁴ The godless are mentioned as the 'dead' in Rabinnic tradition as early as 200 A.D., as carrying the sense of spiritual death.⁵ It is in this vein that Robinson interprets the saying as meaning that there are two spheres represented, "the universe of Death" where the dead bury the dead, and the "new order where Life in Jesus reigns supreme" and "his demands

1. Matt. 8: 22 - Lk. 9: 60.

2. A.H. McNeile, Matthew, pp. 109-110.

3. Ibid., pp. 109-110.

4. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. I, p. 489, "So wenig Sinnvolles hat Jesus nicht gesprochen."

5. Ibid., p. 489: Berakh 2: 4c, 71 on Ecc. 9: 5.

have an overwhelming claim."¹ Manson likewise indicates this as the difference between this man whom Jesus has called, and the others, unclaimed by the gospel, "to whom the requisite funeral rites could in this case be safely left."² To be unclaimed by God or by the message of Jesus is to be dead already, and to be outside of the Kingdom. And it may be inferred that to be claimed by the message and its representative, Jesus, is already to be among the living in the Kingdom.

The contrast between the response to the claim of God with the resultant life, and the wandering far from God with its consequent misery and death, are vividly portrayed in the parable of the Prodigal Son. Both the life apart from and with the Father are experienced by the prodigal son. Twice in the course of the story the Father says of the Prodigal's return and restoration that he "was dead and is alive again; he was lost, and is found" (Lk. 15: 24, 32). Plummer says, "There is probably no difference in meaning between the two halves of the refrain; but νεκρός means 'dead to me,' and ἀπολωλώς 'lost to me.'"³ Easton remarks that the saying means no more than "the father had given up his son as dead."⁴ But these two interpretations

1. J.A. Robinson, Matthew, p. 74.

2. W. Manson, Luke, p. 121.

3. A. Plummer, Luke, p. 376.

4. B.S. Easton, Luke, p. 238.

fail to account for the strong emphasis evidenced by their repetition. Manson strikes at the root of the interpretation when he refers it to the conception already present in the Old Testament, that life is reconciliation to God.¹ The Rabbis had also later considered the godless as already dead though physically living.² There can be little doubt that Jesus was emphasizing the fact of a new life already present in man's reconciliation to God.³ It was a life made possible, both by man's repentance and by God's forgiving love.

LIFE IN COMMUNION.

This teaching on the reconciliation of man to God introduces another aspect of the life in the Kingdom which is already present with the disciples, i.e. a new communion of spirit with one another and with Jesus. This new kinship of disciples is even more binding than earthly ties. Jesus, in fact, recognized no ultimate kinship of blood or race as such for the kinship of the Kingdom was only possible

1. W. Manson, Luke, p. 180. Ezek. 33: 11.
2. Strack-Billerbeck, p. 489.
3. Cf. E.F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, p. 239.

to those whose lives were completely under the sovereign will of God.¹ This communion, already a source of real joy to Jesus and his disciples,² will continue in the coming Kingdom.³ It is a relationship which may be described as a spiritual bond in that the kinship is derived from a common relation of sonship to God, thus representing an aspect of the Kingdom which remains unchanged by outward circumstances. Already the benefits from the new communion accrue to the members of it, even in the present era. Persecutions will come to those who renounce all to follow Jesus, but as a result there will be closer ties with brethren and a community of houses and lands. A new community life is founded which is well described by Wendt as "the community of goods, and the close tie which would bind together the members of the kingdom of God in the bond of mutually helpful love Along with that, we must consider all the other experiences, goods and powers, temporal or spiritual, in which the disciples shall, through the fatherly love of God, become sharers."⁴

That such a community already existed among the disciples is possibly indicated by brief hints in the gospels.⁵

1. Mk. 3: 34.

2. Matt. 9: 14-16.

3. Lk. 22: 14-18, 29-30.

4. H. Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, Vol. I, pp. 239-240. Cf. H. Major, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 133, on Mk. 10: 28-30. O. Holtzmann, however, thinks that these earthly benefits are to come in the Messianic age preceding the Judgment, The Life of Jesus, p. 381.

5. Lk. 8: 3; John 12: 6.

Sharing one's goods, especially with the poor, lay at the heart of the new life in the brotherhood.¹ To do that was to lay up treasure in the life to come. No more penetrating understanding of this spirit to which Jesus referred is to be found than in the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews. This document, (fragments of which are quoted by Jerome) which is itself rather closely parallel though probably secondary to Matthew's Gospel, gives the following as Jesus' reply to the rich man seeking eternal life: "How sayest thou: I have kept the law and the prophets? For it is written in the law: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, and lo, many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clad in filth, dying for hunger, and thine house is full of many good things and nought at all goeth out of it unto them."² If Jesus did not explicitly say these words, His other teaching and activities nevertheless incorporate the spirit of them.

Schweitzer, followed by Warschauer, has maintained that this fellowship of the disciples had also cultic significance. It is the fellowship of the initiates or 'elect'

1. Mk. 10: 21; Lk. 12: 33; Matt. 6: 20.

2. M.R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, p. 6.

in the Kingdom. The feeding of the multitude at the Lake of Gennesareth is an act on Jesus' part to confirm the election of believers in a "cultus-feast which looks forward to the Messianic feast."¹ This feeding of the multitude has the same cultic significance as the Lord's Supper in its symbolic representation of the Messianic meal. Proof for the relation between these two feasts is to be derived from the detailed similarity of the proceedings of Jesus on the two occasions.² Also, the obscure words of Jesus recorded in Mark after the feeding of the four thousand, "They understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened,"³ are more easily explained when the feeding of the multitude is admitted to have symbolical significance. This is further elaborated in the second account of the feeding of the multitude.⁴ Such is the substance of the evidence which Warschauer presents for this cultic view of the disciples' fellowship.⁵

The difficulty of this view lies in the possibility that the tradition itself as contained in Mark was subject to alteration out of high regard for the sacrament of the

1. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 107: cf. Mk. 6: 30-43, 8: 1-21.

2. Mk. 6: 41, 8: 6; cf. Mk. 14: 22.

3. Ibid., 6: 52; cf. Ibid., 8: 14-21.

4. Ibid., 8: 1-10, 14-21.

5. J. Warschauer, The Historical Life of Jesus, p. 144.

Lord's Supper. It has been suggested that, in both cases, the feeding of the followers of Jesus in the wilderness as recorded in Mark has become the nuclei of two series of stories.¹ The evidence for such unity lies in the repeated references to bread in the two series of associated instances, for of the twenty four occurrences of ἀφ' ὧν in Mark, seventeen are found in these two series.² A sacramental significance attached to these recorded instances of the feedings of the multitudes was likely to have been the cause of their becoming the centers of these groups of stories. In the Fourth Gospel almost all of the sacramental teaching is centered in a discourse on the Bread of Life, delivered to those who had participated in the miraculous feeding of the multitude, showing the possible trend in the tradition toward giving increasing sacramental significance to the feeding of the multitudes. Yet it is not unreasonable to suppose that John's interpretation of the event as represented in the discourse on the Bread of Life has an historical basis for its origin.

Bernhard Weiss is convinced that John finds historical materials outside of the Synoptic Gospels for his account of

1. Mk. 6: 30- 8: 26 : Series I, Mk. 6: 30- 7: 37; Series II, Mk. 8: 1-26.

2. W. Manson, Lectures on the History of the Evangelical Tradition, delivered in New College, Spring Term, 1937.

the feedings of the multitudes. He introduces details which are not mere embellishments but must be reminiscences.¹ Some recent gospel criticism tends to give credence to the theory that sources close to the original events and independent of the synoptic sources were used by the author of the Fourth Gospel.² In this case the attempt to crown Jesus by the multitude, if historical, would indicate that the miracle of the loaves had Messianic significance for them.³ The feast was then a Messianic meal, symbolizing the future Messianic fellowship at the Messianic meal in the Kingdom. But in the Johanne discourse, on the miraculous loaves, Jesus explains that the heavenly reality is already present in Himself, and that the feast is the symbol of participation in the life of the eternal world which Jesus inaugurated in his person and message.⁴ So much uncertainty is attached to the Johannine historicity, however, that its use as an original source is possibly unsafe.

There are three aspects in which the breaking of bread by Jesus as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels is significant

1. B. Weiss, Life of Christ, Vol. II, p. 378.

2. G. McGregor, John, p. x; W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, p. 28. C.J. Wright, however, believes that the elaboration of the miracle of the loaves in the Gospel of John is based on the similar miracle in II Kings 4: 42 f., Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 766.

3. John, 6: 15.

4. Ibid., 6: 26-65.

in relation to the life of the Kingdom. First of all, the breaking of bread and dispensing of it by Jesus is recorded to have had symbolic significance. In the instance of the feedings of the multitudes, the significance was difficult for the disciples to understand, much to the amazement of Jesus.¹ At the Last Supper the symbolism is clearly stated by Jesus when the bread and wine are distributed.² Secondly, in the record of the feedings of the multitudes, emphasis falls on the over-sufficiency resulting from even the scanty provisions. While this incident may be due to the embellishment of the miraculous in the story, it appears also in the discussion afterward which Jesus had with his disciples about the event.³ The third significant aspect of the breaking of bread is the centrality of Jesus in his act of dispensing the food. Some new significance is revealed about the Master himself to anyone to whom it is given to understand his act. The Markan narrative significantly follows the feeding of the four thousand, (after an interval of four verses), by Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ. When Jesus again dispenses the food at the

1. Mk. 6: 52, 8: 14-21; cf. Mat. 16: 5-12.

2. Matt. 14: 19; Mk. 14: 22; Lk. 22: 17.

3. Mk. 6: 42, 43; 8: 8 and parallels. Cf. Matt. 16: 9-12; Mk. 8: 16-21.

Last Supper he unfolds to the disciples its special significance in relation to his person.¹ The Lucan narrative of the disciples' walk from Emmaus states that Jesus was known to them only through the blessing and breaking of bread and the distribution of it to them.²

Why did tradition seize upon this act of blessing, breaking, and distributing the bread to center the significant phases of the life of Jesus? Was it not because these acts symbolized Jesus as the Messiah through whom the benefits of the Kingdom came to mankind? Men stood as suppliants before him. They were hungry and he fed them, they were diseased and broken and he brought health to them, they were guilty and he pronounced forgiveness, they were disobedient to God and he reconciled them. That is the testimony of the Synoptic Gospels; that is the conviction of the earliest Christian community about Jesus which came to be embodied in these gospels. The Kingdom of God was already present in him who inaugurated it.³ Men were simply recipients; they were indeed called to become as

1. Matt. 26: 26; Mk. 14: 22; Lk. 22: 19a. Cf. I Cor. 11: 24: Paul's account is actually the oldest complete account we have of the Last Supper. Possibly the original scene is to be reconstructed from Luke 22: 17, 18, 19a, 29, 30: cf. R. Otto, Op. cit., pp. 231, 232.

2. Lk. 24: 30, 31.

3. W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, p. 83.

children in order to receive it.¹ But this life of dispensing the benefits of the Kingdom of God is supremely symbolized in the Last Supper. "This is my body, which is for you."² In these words, or in the briefer saying, "This is my body," with the simple act of distribution, as recorded by Luke, the final act of dedication takes place. Perhaps Jesus saw in this final act that he was taking upon himself the punishment due Israel for its sins in order to bring in the Kingdom. He took this means of identifying himself with the righteous remnant which was to suffer. He was to be their representative.³ The idea was not foreign to the Old Testament that one man should offer himself in behalf of the people.⁴ Some scholars affirm that Jesus' ministry is impregnated with the conception of the Suffering Servant of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.⁵ Despite the objection of Burkitt,⁶ there is much to commend this view. In any case, this final act of dedication symbolized to the early Christian community Jesus offering

1. Lk. 18: 71; cf. Matt. 18: 3.

2. I Cor. 11: 24; cf. Lk. 22: 19.

3. Cf. T. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 435.

4. Ex. 32: 32.

5. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 208 f.; E. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, p. 221; J. Warschauer, The Historical Life of Christ, p. 86.

6. F.C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 39.

himself to bring the new life of the Kingdom to believers.¹

Already in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus appears not only as one who predicts the new life of the Kingdom, but as one who himself embodies it and through whom it begins in others.²

"He revealed and exemplified its law; He exercised its powers; He enjoyed that communion with God, in which its members would participate."³ To follow him was to belong to the Kingdom. Hence Jesus demands absolute loyalty to himself, even to death, for the Kingdom's sake.⁴ The intimate communion of Jesus with God leads him to the conviction that he himself is the chosen medium by which this intimate communion is made possible to others.⁵ Jesus in his person is thus in some fashion a revelation of the divine life of God to men,⁶ and his communion with God is the kind of ultimate communion which the members of the Kingdom are to have with him. His statement that he reveals God, become clear when interpreted as a statement of the Messianic secret which is revealed only to the disciples of the Kingdom.⁷ Jesus reveals God because he brings men face to face

1. Cf. Col. 2: 15.

2. Cf. K.L. Schmidt, Theologische Wörterbuch z. N. T., Lieferung 9, 10, p. 591.

3. E. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, p. 156.

4. Mark 10: 21, 8: 34 ff.

5. Matt. 11: 25-27 - Luke 10: 21, 22.

6. Cf. John 1: 14.

7. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 129. Otto relates this idea of the Messianic secret to I Enoch from which Jesus was said to have taken it, pp. 158, 172 f.

with God in his own person. Because he himself does the will of God, he can call upon men to follow him by repentance. It is in that fashion that he as bringer of the Kingdom is truly Emmanuel,¹ the Messiah in the highest sense of the term. The final word of Jesus can never stop with "learn my teaching;" it must always be carried further in true discipleship into the life with "learn of me."²

The final witness of the Synoptic Gospels to Jesus as the embodiment of the new life of the Kingdom appears in the accounts of the resurrection. Why is the resurrection so vital in the belief of the early church as almost to eclipse the message of the Kingdom of God? Jesus had preached the message of the Kingdom of God, had prepared men for life in the Kingdom, and had made its expectation the constant concern of his disciples.³ Yet the confidence which his disciples had in the coming Kingdom had been imparted to them by Jesus and was expressed by them in loyalty to him.⁴ In him they saw the final representative of the Kingdom. He was the embodiment of its righteousness inherent in the will

1. Matt. 1: 23, "which is, being interpreted, God with us."

2. Matt. 11: 29; cf. I Clement 13: 1, 2; 16: 1-17.

3. Lk. 17: 22 ff., 21: 34 ff.; Mk. 9: 1; Matt. 24: 32 ff., 25: 1 ff.

4. Mk. 8: 35; Lk. 9: 59, 60.

of God.¹ Was this righteousness defeated on the cross? If so, the repentance and life of trust in God demanded for the Kingdom was vain, for God had failed His righteous one,² and the long hoped for vindication of righteousness by God was finally defeated. Again, he was the mediator of its power in his ministry of exorcism, healing, and preaching, so that the beginnings of the Kingdom were already present in his ministry.³ Satan's rule was being defeated, for the power of God had been released in the person of Jesus.⁴ The Spirit of God was upon him and acting through him. But then, here was Jesus on the cross; what must that mean to the disciples? If Jesus had testified the truth when he said that his works were of God, then the power of God had failed on the cross and Satan was finally victorious. After this tragedy of the cross, could the sovereign power of God finally be vindicated on earth? Finally, there was the intimate filial communion of Jesus with God. The consciousness of this relationship had been present at his baptism.⁵ He had later sought to introduce it to his disciples,⁶ and he finally disclosed himself as

1. Matt. 12: 50; Mk. 3: 35; Lk. 8: 21; Matt. 7: 21.

2. Ps. 16: 10. Cf. H. Major, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 217.

3. Lk. 4: 16-21; Matt. 11: 2-6 - Lk. 7: 18-23; Matt. 12: 27, 28 - Lk. 11: 19, 20.

4. Matt. 12: 25-29; Mk. 3: 23-27; Lk. 11: 17-22.

5. Matt. 3: 17; Mk. 1: 11; Lk. 3: 22.

6. Matt. 5: 44, 45 - Lk. 6: 35.

the medium through whom this intimate communion was effected.¹ The relation of the Patriarchs to God had been the basis of Jesus' own argument for a resurrection.² Was this intimate relation of God with Jesus broken by death, the death of the cross? Was the final word, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"³

The importance of the resurrection in the faith of the disciples is readily understood when it is seen that these great convictions about the Kingdom centered in the person of Jesus. The resurrection of Jesus was for the believers, God's vindication of the righteous, God's sovereign power triumphant over Satan, God's communion with believers ultimately insured against death. In the resurrection of Jesus, the beginnings of the Kingdom had already triumphed, and God had vindicated his sovereign rule. The new life of the coming age which Jesus had inaugurated on earth was assured to be life with the power of the resurrection, insuring it victory against Satan and death.

1. Matt. 11: 27 - Lk. 10: 22.

2. Ibid., 22: 31, 32; Mk. 12: 26, 27; Lk. 20: 37, 38.

3. Mk. 15: 34.

CHAPTER III.

THE CONCEPTION OF LIFE IN THE PAULINE WRITINGS.

The previous chapter has indicated, how Jesus absorbed certain current eschatological ideas and brought them to earth, not only in his teaching but in his life. The religion of Jesus thus appears, not as a system of philosophical thought such as Plato or Aristotle offered their contemporaries, but as a religion in which he himself is playing the decisive role, and one which is in the process of unfolding itself in him to the end of his life. If this be true, the old distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion about Jesus is greatly modified.¹

Undoubtedly the difficulty lies in our sources, in distinguishing between what Jesus said or did, and how those who recorded it wrote the disciples' interpretation of these acts and sayings, for they originated as a gospel about a person rather than a biographical sketch. But we have already seen how the Q and Markan materials - the oldest we know - maintain this relation between the person and message of Jesus.

Furthermore, is it not reasonable to suppose that this impression which the disciples had of the identity of

1. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 393.

Jesus with his message originated with the Master himself? Otherwise, there is the gravest difficulty in explaining why this Messianic movement survived the death of its leader while many others perished with the leader's defeat. There were the same abundance of prophecies in the Old Testament and the same apocalyptic ideas on which the followers of Theudas and of Judas of Galilee might draw. Gamaliel was right; if the movement was of the same order as these other two, it must perish.¹ Its survival of the disillusion of the crucifixion requires to be explained, at least in part, by the identity of the message of Jesus with that preached about him by his disciples.² The relation of this early Christian community and Paul to the historical Jesus is well expressed by Oscar Holtzmann:

"The certainty of belonging to the Messiah, and of participating with him in an eternal and blissful life in the future, and the duty of living, for the sake of this hope, a pure and holy life in the footsteps of Jesus, confident that God would one day both remove the taint of sin from the members of the Messianic community, and bestow upon them the holiness of perfection - these were the permanent ideas which survived the disappointment of the first Messianic hopes. And it is to be counted as part of the great life-work of the Apostle Paul that he fully recognized the abiding value of these thoughts, and impressed them again and again upon his congregations."³

1. Acts 5: 33 ff.

2. Cf. A. Schweitzer, Op. cit., p. 393.

3. O. Holtzmann, The Life of Jesus, p. 507.

Certain other questions arise when we turn from the Synoptic teaching of Jesus on life to that of Paul. How far is Paul's mystical conception of life in Christ a product of contact with the mystery religions? Whence come the main features of Paul's sacramental views? If a relation between the Synoptic teaching of Jesus on life and that of Paul can be traced, wherein does that relationship lie?

The relationship between the Gospel of Jesus and that of the first Christian community existed in a common expectation of life in the coming eschaton, although immediate emphasis was placed by the latter upon the reception of the Holy Spirit for witnessing to the Messiahship of Jesus.¹ Foakes Jackson and Lake note three features of importance in the life of this early Christian community:

"(1) They believed themselves to be specially inspired by the Spirit of God and entrusted with a divine message, as had been the prophets of old and Jesus himself. (2) The context of this message was that Jesus was the Messiah, and this rather than the announcement of the Kingdom of God and the need of repentance became central in their preaching. (3) They endeavoured to organize their life on communistic principles."²

According to the Acts, the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost conferred upon the disciples present the gift of

1. Acts 1: 6-8; 3: 21.

2. Foakes Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. I, pp. 305-306. The need of repentance seems nevertheless to have had continued emphasis in the message of the new community in view of the return of Jesus as Messiah, Acts 3: 19, 20.

tongues, by which they could witness to all nations concerning the risen Messiah. The Holy Spirit which had come only to certain chosen prophets in the past now came upon all disciples in fulfillment of Messianic prophecy, in order that they might become witnesses of the risen Messiah.¹

But, although Jesus had risen to the right hand of God, his mighty works on the earth did not cease. He was known as the Author of Life because his healing ministry was still continued in his name by the apostles.² The power of the resurrection seemed somehow to be linked with the healing power of Jesus. The life-giving power of Jesus was still active in absentia through the medium of the apostles,³ much as it had been active in him during his earthly ministry.⁴ Accordingly, in the early Christian community, life was associated with the risen Jesus,⁵ instead of with the Kingdom of God as in the Synoptic Gospels. So far as the disciples were concerned, it probably had reference to the "times of restoration of all things"⁶ to which repentance

1. Acts 2: 1-21, 22-36; 1: 6-8.

2. Acts 3: 6-8, 15-16; cf. 5: 12.

3. Acts 5: 12-16.

4. Mark 6: 7.

5. Acts 3: 15, 2: 28, 5: 20.

6. Acts 3: 21.

was directed.¹ Yet their hope naturally centered in Jesus since as Messiah he was Lord,² and as risen Lord he had exhibited the power of God over death by embodying in himself the risen life.³ Vindication and judgment were therefore appointed to him.⁴ It was he that had poured forth the Holy Spirit at Pentecost in preparation for the age to come.⁵ Through their witness in the Spirit "the Lord added to them day by day those that were saved (τοὺς σωζόμενους)."⁶ While this salvation would be consummated in the life of the age to come, the power which insured it was already released in the miracles of healing.⁷ Satan's power was being overcome and His defeat was inevitable. The powers of life in the age to come were already becoming triumphant.

The life of this first Christian community was early organized on the basis of the expected eschaton. The rite which Jesus had instituted at the Last Supper in view of

1. Acts 11: 18; 13: 46. Cf. Foakes Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 159.
ἡ αἰώνιος "Not 'eternal' life, which is a metaphysical concept entirely foreign to Acts. It refers to the Jewish belief in the 'Age to come,' which would be divinely established after the End."

2. Ibid., 2: 36.

3. Ibid., 2: 27, 28.

4. Ibid., 2: 34.

5. Ibid., 2: 33.

6. Ibid., 2: 47, cf. 2: 40, 41. Not 'being saved' as if the salvation were a process. cf. Foakes Jackson and Lake, The Beginning of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 30.

7. Ibid., 4: 8, 9, 12.

the coming Kingdom was being continued regularly by his disciples.¹ If the prayer which Jesus gave his disciples served as a model, the petition for the Kingdom must have occupied a large place in the prayers which were continually being offered.

To what extent the early Christian community may have been divided on the basis of previous association with orthodox Judaism on the one hand, and liberal Hellenistic Judaism on the other, is difficult to determine. Foakes Jackson and Lake see in the activities of the newly appointed deacons an association with this liberal Hellenizing Judaism.

"This Judaism probably carried on propaganda among the Gentiles, but did not insist on a literal observance of the Law. If the Seven belonged even partially to this kind of 'Liberal' Judaism, the situation is comparatively easy to understand. So long as, before their conversion, they had been merely 'Liberals,' or the Twelve had been merely believers in Jesus, each had been unpopular, but generally free from active persecution; but when Stephen, and later on Peter and Paul combined these causes of offence, the wrath of the orthodox knew no bounds."²

That such a division between these Seven and the Twelve existed in the first Christian community seems likely. The conversion of Paul is, therefore, not simply a conversion to that type of Jewish Christianity represented by the Church of the Apostles in Jerusalem which still looked to

1. Acts 2: 42; cf. Mk. 14: 25; Lk. 22: 18.

2. Foakes Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, Vol. I, p. 308.

Jesus principally as the Messiah who was to come to restore Israel,¹ and to fulfill the terms of the old covenant.²

Paul conceived himself to be "a chosen vessel" to God to bear his name "before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel."³

Paul's mission to the Gentiles is usually regarded as a commission from the Lord and his further activity as obedience to this commission. From one point of view, this is true. Yet an intimate acquaintance with the writings of Paul, as well as the sequence of events as recorded in Acts, makes it apparent that the commission which the apostle felt himself to have received was also the logical consequence of his vision of Jesus on the Damascus road. The expression, τὸς ἐγὼ, Κύριος⁴ suggests the acknowledgement of one who exercised sovereignty. We do not know to what degree the conception of 'Lord' in the religions of Tarsus may have been appropriated by Paul.⁵ Also uncertain is the

1. Acts 1: 6, cf. 3: 21.

2. Ibid., 3: 25.

3. Ibid., 9: 15; cf. Gal. 1: 15. While the words here quoted were spoken to Ananias, they originally represented the conception of Paul as shown in the Galatians passage. Cf. also Acts 26: 15 ff., where the commission and vision occur together, Cf. P. Wrede, Apostelgeschichte, p. 212 f., who regards the latter account in Acts as authentic.

4. Ibid., 26: 15; 9: 5. Cf. F.J. Foakes Jackson, The Life of St. Paul, p. 285 f.

5. W. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, pp. 139 ff.

influence of the mystery religions.¹ But the vision of Jesus, and the use of the term which was almost exclusively used of Yahweh in Israel, suggest the high regard with which Jesus was revealed to Paul. For, in the epistles, Jesus is interpreted, not only as having Lordship over Israel, but also over the cosmos. His relation to the elect is unshaken by all the demonic forces which were thought to control events upon the earth.² The sphere of his sovereignty encompasses all, since through him all things were "created, in the heavens and upon the earth," and "he is before all things, and in him all things consist."³

Obviously, these claims surpass in their scope anything that had hitherto been known in the Primitive Church. The Jewish Messiah had entered competition with the Greek gods and the lords of the mystery religions. The mission of Paul to the Gentiles thus led to claims for Jesus which were more comprehensive than any on the part of the rival religions of his day. These claims probably were not made at the beginning of Paul's ministry. Nevertheless, without the intensity of the vision, without the sense of overwhelming

1. Cf. W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 85, 95, also J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p. 64 f.

2. Rom. 8: 35 ff.

3. Col. 1: 16 ff.

grace¹ and complete abandonment to Jesus as Lord,² Paul would hardly have made such claims for any mortal in view of his strongly monotheistic Jewish upbringing.³ Consequently, the centrality of the Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus gives way to the centrality of Christ with Paul.⁴ Christ is substituted for the Kingdom of God, and remains the representative and embodiment of life in it.

The idea of life (ζωή) in the teaching of Paul also occupies a position of importance: the term is used much more frequently by him than in the synoptic teaching of Jesus. While the teaching of Jesus proclaimed that the Kingdom was to bring life in its wake, the teaching of Paul declared that Christ confers the blessing of life.⁵ This change also is to be explained by the new issues which faced the gospel message in the Gentile world. There was the growing laxness of morality in Rome itself.⁶ There was, what Murray calls, a "loss of nerve" in religion which led it to seek escape from the vicissitudes of the present life

1. II Cor. 12: 9.

2. Phil. 3: 8 ff.

3. Acts 26: 4.
Cf. F.J. Foakes Jackson, The Life of St. Paul, p. 286.

4. K.L. Schmidt, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.B.I., Lief. 9-10, p. 591.

5. Rom. 5: 17.

6. H. Last, Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. X, Ch. xiv, p. 434.

in the ecstasies¹ of Gnosticism² or the retreat of Stoicism.³
 All of this is indicative of the sense of insecurity which prevailed in the world of that age. In the words of Bevan:

"The ancient world was frightened
 Speaking generally, indeed, of the ancient world about the Christian era, it has often appeared to me -- I do not know whether others have got the same impression from the documents -- that the fear of death was much more powerful and more widely diffused than it is among ourselves. When the Gnostics spoke of the world as 'evil,' they seem, for one thing, to have had prominently in mind the subjection of men to death. A New Testament writing speaks of men as being 'through the fear of death all their lifetime subject to bondage' (Hebrews 2: 15).

"To such a mood the announcement of the resurrection of Jesus must have brought a thrill difficult for us to realize -- the supreme Dread not only met but actually defeated within the world men knew!"⁴

In such a world, the message of life in the resurrection of Jesus must inevitably kindle fire, and so indeed it did. To what extent did this message remain pure, to what extent was it changed as it touched the life of the Roman world? This will require the critical faculty to distinguish between form and content, and furthermore to ascertain how far the new is a development of the old and how far it is influenced by the injection of foreign ideas into it.

-
1. G. Murray, Five Stages of Greek Religion, Ch. IV.
 2. E. Bevan, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 87 f.; R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, p. 67.
 3. Cf. particularly the tone of Seneca's Moral Essays, trans. by J.W. Basore. Epictetus has a finer positive note, Discourses & Manual, tr. by P. Matheson.
 4. E. Bevan, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 81 ff.

ZOE AS THE LIFE AFTER DEATH.

In the search for the aspects of life in the Pauline epistles which are equivalent to the synoptic teaching of Jesus, the most obvious correspondence lies in the direction of the future life. Zoe has for Paul no significance apart from the consummation and apart from the hope of life after death. "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable."¹ For Paul, our whole present existence rests on hope alone. Church membership had little if any meaning to Paul and his fellow workers, since the register of the true church (ἐκκλησία - called out) is kept in heaven in the Book of Life by God. Life, therefore, is thought of as a future inheritance much the same as in the Synoptic Gospels.² The similarity is further implied in that both in the synoptic and Pauline views, this present life is lived with a view to the future Zoe.

Yet there is a new element which enters into the Pauline message of the life of the coming age - that is the fact of the resurrection. Not only are believers "heirs of God" but they are "joint-heirs with Christ."³ Jesus could point men

1. I Cor. 15: 19; cf. J. Weiss, I Korintherbrief, p. 355. The ἡλπιότες is to be connected with μόνον and not τῇ ἰσχύϊ ταύτῃ.

2. Matt. 19: 16 ff.; Mk. 10: 17 ff.; Lk. 18: 18 ff. Cf. Rom. 8: 16 f.

3. Rom. 8: 16, 17; cf. especially vs. 37, 38 where fellowship with Christ means security of the believer.

to no actual triumph over death that would guarantee their hope in his gospel. Paul was equipped with the knowledge of a historical person who had been raised from the dead, who appeared to him in person after his death, and who was now participating with God in the life to come. The κἀνπερόμεναι is transformed into συγκληρομέμεναι Χριστοῦ. Yet, already, in his earthly ministry, Jesus had called upon men to share his lot with a view to the coming kingdom. To the rich young ruler who would have eternal life, his reply was, "Come, follow me."¹ Then, later, in answer to Peter's question about rewards to those who left all to follow him, Jesus gives the promise of eternal life in the world to come.² The difference between Paul and Jesus was this: Paul could point men to the assurance of the life to come in fellowship with Jesus as already guaranteed by the resurrection of Jesus;³ Jesus could point men only to the evidences of the inbreaking eschaton in his works of power.⁴

For Paul the resurrection of believers, which is associated with the life in the age to come, is the logical as well as the chronological sequence of the resurrection

1. Mk. 10: 21.

2. Ibid., 10: 29.

3. Phil. 3: 8-11; Rom. 6: 8 ff.

4. Matt. 11: 2 ff. - Lk. 7: 18 ff.; Matt. 12: 28 - Lk. 11: 20.

of Christ, so that in I Corinthians 15 the latter is made the argument for the former. Paul expresses the order of this sequence as "first Christ then those of Christ in the Parousia"¹ This intimate association of the resurrection of Jesus as a present fact with the resurrection of believers at the Parousia on the basis of an existing intimate relation of the believer with Jesus, is constantly in the background of Paul's gospel even when it is not explicitly stated.² In communion with Jesus, the present life of the believer is lived in the "Jenseits" already.³ It is this σὺν Χριστῷ which binds the Pauline teaching of life to that of Jesus, since 'life' in both, is conditioned by fellowship with Jesus, in the one case simply anticipating the fellowship with Jesus as the Messiah in the Kingdom,⁴ in the other case both realizing and anticipating that fellowship with the risen Christ Jesus.⁵ This σὺν Χριστῷ then becomes ἐν Χριστῷ possibly through the impact with Hellenistic Gnosticism or else through the influence of Persian Zoroastrianism similar to that exercised on the rival contemporaneous oriental mystery religions.⁶

1. I Cor. 15: 23.

2. J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, p. 421 "Sie haben das Leben und sollens doch noch empfangen." Cf. J.E. Frame, Thessalonians, p. 190; O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, Vol. I. p. 196.

3. I. Thess. 5: 5 ff.

4. Lk. 22: 14-18, 29-30 cf. Matt. 9: 14-16.

5. Rom. 8: 16, 17; - Phil. 1: 21-23.

6. R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, pp. 408-409.

Life, in the eschatological sense, is the end of God's relation with man and man's activity in relation thereto. It is the goal toward which the believer is striving, the end (τέλος) to which a life of service of God is pursued.¹ God's reign of grace in the individual with its victory over sin is directed "unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."² While Kennedy's statement is true that, "Plainly, there is an organic connection between ζωή and that human experience of which it is the culmination," his further statement that, "It is in no sense an acquirement added on at death, or judgment, or the inauguration of the coming Aeon," scarcely explains this strong note of future expectation in Paul's writings.³ Paul is looking to a transformation to occur in which the corruptible body will be exchanged for an incorruptible one, "for it is necessary that corruption be clothed with incorruption and mortality be clothed with immortality, then shall come to pass the saying, "Death is swallowed up in victory"⁴ For death is the last enemy to be put down at the Parousia.⁵ There seems to be a very real sense in which Zoe is "an

1. Rom. 6: 22; cf. I Tim. 6: 12.

2. Rom. 5: 21.

3. H.A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, p. 155; cf. I Cor. 15: 19.

4. I Cor. 15: 53, 54.

5. I Cor. 15: 23 ff.

acquirement added on at death, or judgment, or the inauguration of the coming Aeon."¹ It is of a different order from the present life else it would not be the final reward of those who are "patient in well doing" which will be granted them "in the day of revelation of the righteous judgment of God."²

Thus, as with Jesus, so with Paul, the Great Judgment precedes the bestowal of eternal life on the doers of righteousness. However, for Paul, the believer is in a separate category and is already justified so that he will be transformed at the Parousia. Thus life means escape from the wrath to come both for Jesus and for Paul when regarded from the negative point of view, although by neither of them is the negative aspect greatly stressed.³ For Paul, this negative aspect of life is represented as "salvation" (σωτηρία), which is God's gracious deliverance from the wrath to come.⁴ The selection of the 'saved' who will escape the coming wrath is already taking place, and in view of this selection, these 'saved' are summoned to

1. H.A. Kennedy, Op. cit., p. 155.

2. Rom. 2: 4 ff.

3. Cf. Rom. 2: 4 ff., with Mk. 9: 43-48 and Matt. 25: 31-46, 7: 13, 14.

4. Cf. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 871 (?) Rom. 5: 9, 10. Note the future tense throughout this passage. Also A. Titius, N.T. Lehre von der Seligkeit, p. 50, Pt. II.

arm themselves with the God-designed equipment in the present life.¹ Since, at the Judgment, each will be rendered according to his works,² a man's present conduct becomes of great importance in determining his ultimate destiny.²

Paul's view of the life in the coming Kingdom differs from that of Jesus. As has previously been noted, Jesus did not express a very clear idea of the form in which the Kingdom would come and his intimations are at best uncertain concerning a preliminary Messianic reign. Paul, on the contrary, must have been quite familiar with contemporaneous Apocalyptic thought in this regard, so that he adopts the eschatological belief of later Judaism, according to which the Messianic Kingdom will be inaugurated, and Satan will no longer be able to injure mankind.³ First comes the reign of Christ during which all enemies will be subjected to him, then the Kingdom will be delivered to the Father.⁴ The resurrection of the righteous, however, occurs at the Parousia with the possible inference that the righteous who have risen will reign with Jesus during this interim period.

1. I Thess. 5: 5-10; Vs. 8 insures the fact that the salvation is future in its use of the expression ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας. Cf. also H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 159.

2. Rom. 2: 4 ff.

3. Cf. Book of Jubilees; W. Bousset, "Die Schriften des N.T.," Vol. II, p. 152. "Jesus als nicht schriftgelehrter Laie, scheint diese Idee nicht gekannt zu haben. Paulus als Theologe kennt sie."

4. I Cor. 15: 23 ff.

Such a view is also found in late Apocalyptic thought.¹
The righteous will also participate in the execution of judgment.²

With regard to the form of this resurrection life, Paul is much more specific than Jesus. Especially in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians he treats in detail the argument for the resurrection life. Jesus had described the condition of the risen in terms similar to those which Enoch had used.³ They neither "marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven."³ Does Paul follow Jesus in deriving his conception of life in the resurrection from contemporary apocalyptic literature, or has he in some measure conformed it to other contemporary ideas of his day? Opinion is fairly well divided on this question.

The Greek view of life after death, as it was most widely held in Paul's day, is probably best represented in the teachings of Epictetus. In his genial, conversational style, he has expressed the Stoic disdain for the body in these words: "What am I? A miserable creature of a man'; and 'my wretched rags of flesh.' Wretched indeed, but you have something better than 'your rags of flesh.' Why then do you discard the better and cling to your rags?"⁴

1. W. Bousset, Op. cit., p. 152; Rom. 5: 17.

2. J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, p. 420; I Cor. 6: 2.

3. Mk. 12: 25, 26; cf. I Enoch 15: 6, 7.

4. Epictetus, The Discourses and Manual, trans. by P.E. Matheson, Vol. I. p. 52.

He also replies in the same vein to the question about the fear of execution by the emperor; "If a man has once entered a philosopher's lecture-room and does not know what his true self is, he deserves to fear and to flatter what he flattered afterwards: I mean, if he has not yet learnt that he is not flesh or bones or sinews, but the faculty which uses them, and which also governs the impressions and understands them."¹ The inference is that the philosopher expected a bodiless intellectual existence after death.² The Pythagorean writings suggested that the present body is a σκήνος, from which Paul may have adopted the use of the term. More striking than these instances of Greek influence is Paul's use of the Stoic term πολίτευμα to express the idea of the believer's place in the future resurrection. Epictetus associates this closely with his conception of kinship to God as well as citizenship in the universe.³ However, in these instances, scarcely more than verbal agreement between Paul and Greek philosophic thought is to be found.

1. Epictetus, The Discourses and Manual, trans. by P.E. Matheson, Vol. II, Bk. IV., Ch. 7, p. 171.

2. E.Evans, Corinthians, pp. 137, 138.

3. Epictetus, The Discourses and Manual, trans. by P.E. Matheson, Vol. I, Bk. I, Ch. 9, p. 70.

Reitzenstein has made a serious attempt to connect Paul's thought with late Persian eschatology:

"Ernennt zunächst die Voraussetzung für alles Vorausgegangene wie für das Folgende, das grundlegende Dogma der spätern iranischen Eschatologie: die Materie selbst (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα), das schlechthin Vergängliche (die φθορά, wie im Iransichen ein konkreter Begriff) ist von der Gotteswelt (ἀφθαρσία) ausgeschlossen Paulus lehrt, dass für sie an Stelle von Tod und Auferstehung, die ja nur Verwandlung sind, eine andere Art Verwandlung tritt. Sie gleicht einem Überkleiden der Materie durch das Immaterielle"¹

On the other hand, Bousset, who would be expected to adopt a similar position on the basis of comparative religion, says that Paul introduces an entirely new conception in his idea of a spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν), quite foreign to the sickly intellectualism of the Greeks on the one hand, and to the Jewish expectation of the resurrection of the earthly body on the other. He was the first to conceive of a resurrection in an entirely different body.²

Although Weiss suggests that I Corinthians 15: 50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit incorruption," may even have originated with Jesus himself, it seems improbable that sufficient evidence can be found to verify this. Yet Weiss is probably justified in averring its Palestinian origin,³ especially in

1. R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, p. 351. I Cor. 15: 50 ff.

2. W. Bousset, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Vol. II, (I Cor. 15: 44) p. 155.

3. J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 377.

view of the parallel conceptions contained in the Enochian literature.¹ Nevertheless, Reitzenstein indicates the Persian source which influenced not only the Greek thought but the Hebrew as well, and which also may have been influential on the Judaism of Tarsus.²

Here again the determining factor is Paul's vision of the risen Christ rather than contemporaneous religious ideas. For it is with the appearances of the risen Christ that Paul begins his argument for the resurrection. Then he continues by declaring: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither has Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith is also vain."³ It is therefore in view of his experience of the risen Christ that Paul's interpretation of the resurrection may be said to differ from that of Jesus. Jesus seems to have conformed to the belief in a resurrection which was already current in certain circles in his time. Paul finds the concepts of Judaism inadequate to express all that he felt was true of the resurrection. He struggles to express what this "transfiguration by conformation to the likeness of the glorified Lord" can mean.⁴ He

1. I Enoch 62: 15, 16; Secrets of Enoch 22: 8. Cf. II. Cor. 5: 2.

2. Wm. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, p. 156.

3. I Cor. 15: 14; cf. Rom. 6: 8.

4. B.W. Bacon, Jesus and Paul, p. 106.

had seen in the vision of Christ not only a glorified person but a glorified world which, as Reitzenstein so accurately distinguishes, is a world incorruptible and of a different essence from this corruptible and transitory world of flesh and blood.¹

Paul uses the term δόξα to describe this new quality of life which radiated from Christ and into which the believer will be transformed.² It is therefore a sphere of light into which the believer will come and in which he will participate.³ The analogy which is drawn by Paul between the believer and Moses⁴ has its parallel representation of Moses in the Targum. According to this interpretation, Moses unconsciously absorbs in his countenance the rays from the Shekina of Yahweh as he is conversing with Yahweh on the holy mount,⁴ reflecting them when he descends to the people. In like manner, says Paul, the believer, in beholding Christ, reflects the rays of glory from him, and is transformed by them "into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit."⁵

It is to be observed that the terms Κορίαι and πνεύματος are both employed to designate the supersensuous

1. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 351.

2. Cf. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 871, II Cor. 3: 6-18.

3. Cf. I Enoch 58: 5, 92: 4; I Thess. 5: 4.

4. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. III, p. 514, Targ. Jerush. I Ex. 34: 29 ff.

5. II Cor. 3: 18.

mode of existence into which the believer is transformed. The interchange of these two terms by Paul may be due in the one case to his identification of the glorified Christ with the whole sphere of his glorified existence, and in the other to his personification of the heavenly sphere which is wholly controlled from within by the life of God. Paul saw the most real instance of this in the glorified Jesus as he was revealed to himself.

The transformed body is variously described by Paul as "a building from God, a house not made with hands,"¹ or a garment with which the believer is "clothed upon"² when "death is swallowed up in victory."³ Indeed in view of these expressions, the new body appears to be a garment which enshrouds but transforms the old body. That such is Paul's thought appears in his description of this change, first in the negative, then in the positive sense: "... Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption We shall all be changed For this corruptible must put on incorruption (in its place), and this mortal must put on immortality (in its place)."⁴ The expressions signifying reclothing

1. II Cor. 5: 1.

2. Ibid. 5: 2.

3. I Cor. 15: 54.

4. Ibid. 15: 50-53.

in order to be consistent must therefore be interpreted as meaning changing the one kind of body for the other. A similar analogy is given in that of the seed bearing fruit, "That which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind; but God giveth it a body even as it pleased him, and to each seed a body of its own."¹ Here, again, the analogy suggests that the mortal body, the same as the bare grain, dies and is changed through the miraculous act of God to a different body.² Beyschlag opposes this view, supporting the view that the analogy of the seed which is planted has reference to the process of germination so that the transformation of the believer's body is already in process. In answer to this position in general, Paul's reference to the seed is applied as illustration, not of the change of the inner man,³ but as the change of the body. Contemporaneous Jewish thought seems to have held that the resurrection was a quickening from death again to life after the analogy of the seed planted in the earth.⁴

1. I Cor. 15: 36-38.

2. Cf. J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 368 f; also I Clem. 24: 5.

3. On the survival of the soul alive at the death of the body until the resurrection, cf. E. Evans, Corinthians, p. 139.

4. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. III, p. 475; cf. the saying of R. Eliezer, c. 90A.D.

At this point, the thought of Paul is akin to that of Jesus. Hope in the life to come resided in the power (δύναμις) of God alone and in His mercy toward the believer, for which the latter has no claim except God's call.¹ There is nothing inherent in mortal existence to warrant it.² It is the Spirit from God which must "bear witness with our spirits" before we can know that we are "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ."³ We may therefore say that for the most part, Paul's conception of life after death corresponds to that of Jesus. He differs from Jesus in his conception of a Messianic age at which time the believers will be transformed or raised from the dead, but he agrees with Jesus that eternal life will be given to those, other than the saints, who have been transformed at the great Judgment. His conception of the transformed body and new life is closely akin to that of Jesus, so far as we may judge from the brief hints we have in the Gospels. However, he uses current Greek terms to express his idea although this aspect of his thought is largely Jewish apocalyptic. In his picture of the new life, Paul tends to emphasize the inward condition (righteousness, peace, and joy) rather than the

1. Mk. 12: 24 ff. Cf. Eph. 1: 3-5, 19-20, 2: 4; II Thess. 2: 13 f.

2. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., Bd. II, Lief. 14, p. 866.

3. Rom. 8: 16, 17.

outward state, as Jesus sometimes seems to do.¹ But this change can also be attributed to the difference between the environment of Paul's gospel, characterized as it was by the moral and spiritual despair of his age, and that of Jesus in which political hopelessness was buoyed up by visions of a transformed social and political order.

PAULINE ANTHROPOLOGY.

This difference in environment probably contributes more to Paul's anthropology than any other phase of his doctrine. It is here that he differs almost completely from Jesus. Jesus, as has been indicated above, viewed the Psyche as man's physical, personal existence upon the earth, practically equivalent to the Nephesh of the Old Testament. It may be employed for good or for ill.² Likewise, he follows the Hebrew idea of the body as that which is subject to human weakness,³ but which is valued highly along with the Psyche, as man's most precious possession upon the earth.⁴ On the other hand, Paul holds

1. Matt. 19: 28 - Lk. 22: 30; Matt. 8: 11 - Lk. 13: 29; cf. Rom. 14: 17.

2. Lk. 12: 20.

3. Matt. 10: 28.

4. Lk. 12: 23 - Matt. 6: 25.

a distinctly unfavorable view of what he variously terms the Sarchical, Somatic, or Psychical nature of man. There can scarcely be any doubt that his view is influenced at least in form, if not in content, by Greek or Gnostic ideas. It is true that in those instances where Man's nature is set in contrast to God's with respect to his weakness or foolishness that Paul's use of the term "sarx" corresponds to the Old Testament "Basar" (Rom. 9: 20, Gal. 2: 16, I Cor. 1: 29; cf. Gen. 2: 7, II Chron. 32: 8, Ps. 56: 4, 73: 26, Isa. 40: 6).

The problem arises to what extent Paul has become Gnostic in his view of the relation between flesh and sin. No more difficult problem faces the New Testament scholar than this. Reitzenstein followed by Weiss is stimulating to read both because of the striking illumination from Hellenistic literature by the former and because of the brilliant and comprehensive treatment of Paul's view by the latter. Reitzenstein shows from contemporaneous literature the metaphysical dualism which existed in Hellenistic thought between the bodily (ἐν σώματι) and bodiless (ἐν ἄσωμάτῳ) existence. In the world of the former, nothing is true (real) (ἀληθές); in the world of the latter everything is without falsehood (ἄψευδές).¹

1. R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, p. 78; Stobaios Ekl., I, p. 275, 18 W.

Of course, this analogy would not be so significant if the Jewish diaspora had been an exclusive group with no influence from or upon its Hellenistic environment. In Palestine itself, there seems to be little doubt about the process of Hellenization which Antiochus Epiphanes had well begun but which was brought to a sudden end by his rashness. Nor had influence been absent from Persian and Chaldean sources during the exile. "The Diaspora which produced Paul and Philo was always more liberal in its outlook than the homeland, and more exposed to the contagion of foreign ideas."¹ This statement, while perhaps inaccurate in particular instances as such general statements are likely to be, has its element of truth. The same element of truth is to be found in Murray's statement that Gnostic sects were scattered over the Hellenistic world well before the time of Paul and Apollos, with their idea of a saviour like the Jewish Messiah. They had probably already existed in Antioch and Tarsus. "A completely non-Christian standpoint is still visible in the Mandaean and Manichean systems."² That the Manichean system was non-Christian is questioned by Reitzenstein which he holds to be an amalgamation of Buddhism,

1. S. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 192 f. To put Paul and Philo in the same category and call synagogues of the diaspora, "seedpots of syncretism" in relation to Hellenism is perhaps too sweeping to warrant accuracy.

2. G. Murray, Five Stages of Greek Religion, pp. 196, 197. Cf. W. Scott, Hermetica Vol. I, pp. 241 ff.-indicates that the idea of a saviour is late in third century in these writings, contr. Murray.

Zoroastrianism, and Christianity.¹ On the other hand he significantly agrees with Murray and finds support from W. Bauer, Bultmann, H. H. Schaeder, and Ed. Meyer in attributing Mandaeism to a pre-Christian origin.² However, that Paul used Gnostic mystery forms of expression, especially relating to the dualism of the psychical and pneumatic spheres of existence, is hardly open to doubt.³

Another consideration of primary importance should not be neglected. There was in the Primitive Church "No New Testament, no thought-out theology, no stereotyped traditions. The men who took Christianity to the Gentile world had no special training, only a great experience.----"⁴ The forms of thought must therefore have been sought wherever they conformed to and were useful in testifying of this experience. There was therefore nothing to insure consistency in the message of such a one as Paul.

Accordingly, the Pauline anthropology can scarcely be regarded as consistent.⁵ Stevens has pointed out what were the likely steps in the development of his thought from its

1. R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, p. 56.

2. Ibid., p. 16 Note. Contr., cf. E. Peterson, Zeitschrift f. N. T. Wissenschaft, Band 27, Heft 1, p. 63.

3. Ibid., p. 76 f.; cf. B.W. Bacon, Jesus and Paul, pp. 68 ff.; W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, pp. 15 ff., p. 141; S. Angus, Op. cit. p. 295 et al.

4. B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, p. 45.

5. Cf. G. Gilbert, The First Interpreters of Jesus, p. 42f., on the many uses of the term 'flesh.' H. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 156 f., neglects important aspects in referring this use of Psyche and Spirit to the Old Testament too completely.

Zoroastrianism, and Christianity.¹ On the other hand he significantly agrees with Murray and finds support from W. Bauer, Bultmann, H. H. Schaeder, and Ed. Meyer in attributing Mandaeism to a pre-Christian origin.² However, that Paul used Gnostic mystery forms of expression, especially relating to the dualism of the psychical and pneumatic spheres of existence, is hardly open to doubt.³

Another consideration of primary importance should not be neglected. There was in the Primitive Church "No New Testament, no thought-out theology, no stereotyped traditions. The men who took Christianity to the Gentile world had no special training, only a great experience.----"4 The forms of thought must therefore have been sought wherever they conformed to and were useful in testifying of this experience. There was therefore nothing to insure consistency in the message of such a one as Paul.

Accordingly, the Pauline anthropology can scarcely be regarded as consistent.⁵ Stevens has pointed out what were the likely steps in the development of his thought from its

1. R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, p. 56.

2. Ibid., p. 16 Note. Contr., cf. E. Peterson, Zeitschrift f. N. T. Wissenschaft, Band 27, Heft 1, p. 63.

3. Ibid., p. 76 f.; cf. B.W. Bacon, Jesus and Paul, pp. 68 ff.; W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, pp. 15 ff., p. 141: S. Angus, Op. cit. p. 295 et al.

4. B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, p. 45.

5. Cf. G. Gilbert, The First Interpreters of Jesus, p. 42f., on the many uses of the term 'flesh.' H. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 156 f., neglects important aspects in referring this use of Psyche and Spirit to the Old Testament usage too completely.

Jewish sources:

"Man's weakness is, in one aspect of it, moral weakness; but moral weakness is not merely negative, but positive. Thus with 'the flesh' is naturally associated the notion of positive sinfulness. The flesh is not merely weak, but is the seat of passions and impulses which easily give occasion to sinful choices and actions."¹

While the beginning of the entrance of sin into the world is referred to Adam,² Adam's fall is repeated in each man.³ In Romans 7: 11-23, sin appears as a separate entity which finds a foothold(ἀφ' ὧν) in the flesh, which is identified with the Ego.⁴ According to this view, the flesh is neutral, but has been possessed by sin through its weakness.⁵ While the law of the members is at present warring against the law of the mind (νόμος),⁶ yet these same members may be presented to God as instruments of righteousness.⁷ Likewise, the body (σῶμα) may be referred to as the body of sin,⁸ yet may become used for righteousness.⁹ Similarly the Psyche is regarded as that part of man which is opposed to God in the same way as the flesh (I Cor. 2: 14 ff.) It, likewise,

1. G.B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, p.342.

2. Rom. 5: 12. Cf. IV Esra 3: 5, 20, 21; 4: 30 which refers sin to the evil seed in the heart.

3. Ibid., 7: 7-12.

4. Ibid., 7: 14.

5. Ibid., 8: 3.

6. Ibid., 7: 23, cf. 25.

7. Ibid., 6: 13.

8. Ibid., 6: 6.

9. Ibid., 6: 12, 13; 12: 1.

is set over against the things of God.

In all of these passages Paul seems to be viewing sin in its empirical relation to the flesh; and in the one passage where he "treats of the beginning of human sin (Rom. 5: 12 sq.), he ascribes it to a voluntary act of transgression (παράβασις), and not to the nature of a physical organism which is regarded as itself evil."¹ However, it is man's moral condition in its present state that Paul concerns himself in this section of the epistle to the Romans.

Yet granting that Paul seems to arrive at his point of view empirically rather than metaphysically, he says nevertheless, that in its present state no good thing dwells in his flesh (Rom. 7: 7). In the flesh it is impossible to please God (Rom. 8: 8). The flesh itself seems to contain an evil principle which enslaves men who do not walk according to the spirit (Rom. 8: 4f.) Flesh and spirit are in warfare with one another - actively opposed to each other (Gal. 5: 16 f.) In these instances, flesh is not simply human weakness, nor is it conceived

1. G.B. Stevens, Op.cit., p. 339.

psychologically, but it is a cosmic principle which is opposed to God. Paul uses it as identified with sin, the death of which permits man to be quickened with Christ. And further parallel with these two ideas, is that of being "dead with Christ from the rudiments (στοιχεῖων) of the world." (Col. 2: 13, 20).¹ Nay, to be in Christ is a new creation (καὶ νῦν κτίσις)! (II Cor. 5: 17). Particularly clear is Paul's Gnostic trend in contrasting the natural (ψυχικός) man and the spiritual (πνευματικός) man in their respective understanding of the things of the Spirit of God (I Cor. 2: 14 f.) To the former, the things of the Spirit cannot be discerned.² Neither can the spirit of man discern them (I Cor. 2: 11). The same antithesis exists in Paul's conception of the Psychical body and the spiritual body (I Cor. 15: 44), and if the complete difference between the two bodies is as marked as has been indicated above, the ψυχικός stands for a completely different nature.³

These instances indicate clearly how Paul's thought passes from a position of ethical to that of a metaphysical dualism. Yet even here, the thought forms are often less

1. In this epistle Paul is opposing certain Gnostic trends in which other mediaries other than Christ are set between man and God. Like Philo, however, Paul adopts Hellenism to oppose Hellenism.

2. Cf. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 76 f.

3. Cf. J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, p. 476 f.

Hellenistic than apocalyptic. There is no hope for the future bodiless existence to which the Greeks were looking, but rather for a transformed body.¹ There is less of the thought that the present body is a prison to be escaped than an organ which is inadequate for the expression of the Spirit. There is no thought in Paul as in Hellenism that the true life of man is found by searching for the divine within.² Yet, in his emphasis on the transitoriness of material things, and the connection of the evil of the world with sensual passion, Paul seems to be a Gnostic.³ The vision of Jesus which is the new point of reference from which he lives, on the one hand, and his own experience of struggle with sin, on the other, condition his outlook in such a way that it may hardly be said to be either strictly Jewish, or purely Gnostic.⁴ The true life, for Paul, cannot be realized in the present state of the natural man, the end of which can only be death.⁵ What Jesus was anticipating with the coming of the Kingdom, Paul was anticipating with the change of this

1. Cf. W. Bousset, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Vol. II, p. 159.

2. W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, p. 136; cf. J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, p. 476.

3. E. Bevan, Hellenism and Christianity, p. 93.

4. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 91.

5. Cf. E. Scott, The Kingdom of God, p. 157, 158.

natural man. "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death. I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7: 24, 25).

This life of the risen Jesus stands over against the frailty of the flesh. He Himself had come in the "likeness of sinful flesh" to condemn sin in the flesh (Rom. 8: 3, 4). This ὁμοιωμάτι in no sense expresses the apostle's desire to avoid attributing sin to Jesus in conformity to some docetic view of Jesus' life on earth.¹ Rather, it is meant to express the very opposite - that in Jesus' crucifixion, the sin in the flesh was condemned or sentenced (κατέκρινε), giving freedom to the reign of the Spirit. But in his resurrection, Jesus is not only risen Lord but the bestower of life upon mankind, in contrast with Adam who has conferred the predisposition to sin, and death (I Cor. 15: 21, 22). He is the beginning of a new humanity which is no longer subject to the frailty of the earthly, but has the quality of heavenly incorruption (I Cor. 15: 45-49). Not only over the frailty of the transient material, but over the degradation and corruption of sin, this new humanity is victorious (Rom. 5: 17).

The early Christian community had seen in Jesus, the Messiah Himself, hidden in the flesh. According to this

1. Cf. J. Denney, The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. II, p. 645.

tradition, he had received the Holy Spirit with power at His baptism, and had thereby been approved of God to do his mighty works against Satan (Acts 10: 38; 2: 22). The in-breaking of the eschaton was beginning in the earthly life of Jesus, and was continued by this same power of the Spirit after his resurrection. Christ now reigns: the *dunamis* has become the Spirit.¹ Such also was the teaching of Jesus.

Paul's thought differs from that of the Primitive Christian community and of Jesus Himself, in that the *dunamis* is associated primarily with the Risen Christ. There is not the slightest intimation by Paul that the Spirit was received by Jesus, or that the power of God was in him before the resurrection -no intimation of Jesus' baptismal experience. On the contrary, Jesus' life on earth was intended for the humiliation of the flesh, the setting aside of power.² Its sole significance for the doctrine of Paul lay in the crucifixion of the flesh and sin in the flesh, in order that God might raise up Jesus as son by his victory over death and sin (Rom. 1: 4, Phil. 2: 6-8, Rom. 8: 3). Thus, for Paul, the whole meaning and content of the life of the coming Kingdom is embodied in this risen Christ, and the Spirit to which the Resurrection is attributed (Rom. 8: 11). The term "Kingdom" disappears and in its place the terms "life," or "Christ," or "Spirit," which designate the nature and sphere of this higher life, are substituted.

1. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 121.

2. Phil. 2: 6-11.

tradition, he had received the Holy Spirit with power at His baptism, and had thereby been approved of God to do his mighty works against Satan (Acts 10: 38; 2: 22). The in-breaking of the eschaton was beginning in the earthly life of Jesus, and was continued by this same power of the Spirit after his resurrection. Christ now reigns: the dunamis has become the Spirit.¹ Such also was the teaching of Jesus.

Paul's thought differs from that of the Primitive Christian community and of Jesus Himself, in that the dunamis is associated primarily with the Risen Christ. There is not the slightest intimation by Paul that the Spirit was received by Jesus, or that the power of God was in him before the resurrection -no intimation of Jesus' baptismal experience. On the contrary, Jesus' life on earth was intended for the humiliation of the flesh, the setting aside of power.² Its sole significance for the doctrine of Paul lay in the crucifixion of the flesh and sin in the flesh, in order that God might raise up Jesus as son by his victory over death and sin (Rom. 1: 4, Phil. 2: 6-8, Rom. 8: 3). Thus, for Paul, the whole meaning and content of the life of the coming Kingdom is embodied in this risen Christ, and the Spirit to which the Resurrection is attributed (Rom. 8: 11). The term "Kingdom" disappears and in its place the terms "life," or "Christ," or "Spirit," which designate the nature and sphere of this higher life, are substituted.

1. Cf. R. Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 121.

2. Phil. 2: 6-11.

CHRIST, THE NEW SPHERE OF LIFE.

How, then, is the conception of Christ transferred from that of a person to a new sphere of life in the writings of Paul? It is true that in the Primitive Church, the Messiah occupies the place which the Kingdom had previously, now that Jesus is risen from the dead and exalted to the place of power next to God (Acts 2: 22 ff.). But nowhere in the preaching of Peter does Jesus seem to occupy the place of the super-sensuous sphere of existence, nor is the believer regarded as "in Christ."

According to Albert Schweitzer, the connection lies in the relation of the predestined elect with the Messiah, as it appears in I Enoch and other eschatological writings. This relation is first associated with the remnant, in the Prophetic writings (Isa. 4: 3, Mal. 3: 16, 17), who through the disasters upon the earth are preserved by God and destined to the Messianic kingdom. The eschatological aspect is however most clearly elucidated in the representation that the names of the saints are inscribed in the book of life (Ps. 69: 29; Dan. 12: 1; Enoch 103: 2, etc.) and that they are a community to be revealed along with the Messiah (I Enoch 62: 7, 8, 14, 15.)¹ He then goes further

1. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 101, 102.

to show wherein it is equivalent to Jesus' own teaching of the predestined community of saints.

Now Schweitzer's interpretation of the life in Christ with reference to Jesus' own teaching is indeed warranted by an examination of that teaching. Already, the importance of the fellowship with Jesus has been indicated. He calls upon men to enter into fellowship with him, not only in his life, but in his death and persecutions (Matt. 5: 11, 12, Mk. 8: 35, 38). Now the chief significance of this is their belonging to the Son of Man in the Judgment, since already in fellowship with and in following Jesus the disciples have fellowship with the Son of Man who is yet to be fully revealed.¹ Schweitzer goes on to point out that for Paul this solidarity between Christ and his elect was already being realized after the resurrection of Jesus, in that they have shared with him the resurrection mode of existence before the resurrection has begun for the remainder of the dead.¹

"The fundamental significance of the dying and rising again of Jesus consists therefore, according to Paul, in the fact that thereby death and resurrection have been set afoot throughout the whole corporeity of the elect to the Messianic Kingdom. This is, so to speak, a mass of piled-up fuel, to which the fire there kindled immediately spreads. But whereas this dying and rising again has been openly manifested in Jesus, in the Elect it goes forward secretly but none the less really. Since in the nature

1. A. Schweitzer, Ibid., pp. 105-109.

of their corporeity they are now assimilated to Jesus Christ, they become, through His death and resurrection, beings in whom dying and rising again have already begun, although the outward seeming of their natural existence remains unchanged.

"In consequence of undergoing this mysterious process they are capable, on the Return of Christ, of immediately receiving, whether they are then surviving or already dead, the resurrection state of existence."¹

Certainly there is much in this view to commend itself to serious thought; and few more deserving attempts have been made to set the life in Christ of Paul in relation to the teaching of Jesus. Paul adopts much in the eschatology of I Enoch in his conception of the heavenly sphere and the Messiah who rules in it. The heavenly sphere is a sphere of light (II Cor. 4: 4 - I Enoch 38: 4) according to which the elect are called "children of light" (Eph. 5: 8 - I Enoch 108: 11). In contrast with this world of light is "this present evil world" (Gal. 1: 4 - I Enoch 48: 7). There are similar references to the exalted Messiah before whom "every knee should bow" (Phil. 2: 10 - I Enoch 48: 5). But there is nothing in this "Messiah, Son of Man" concept to suggest a mystical relation of the elect being "in the Messiah" or the Messiah being in the elect.

1. A. Schweitzer, Ibid., p. 110.

There is another phenomenon which also has not been accounted for. That is the total disappearance of the term "Son of Man" from the Pauline writings. It can perhaps be partly accounted for by the unfamiliarity of the term to the Greek populace and Hellenistic converts of early Christianity, or perhaps by Jesus' own use of it to hide His identity as Messiah, so that its use was no longer necessary after his disclosure as the Messiah by his resurrection.¹ However, Paul himself gives us a hint of the direction in which to look for his Christ-mysticism, whereby the believer becomes a new man in Christ.

In his doctrine of the first and second Adam we have in Paul's own words the relation of the Christ to the human race.² Thus it is not necessary to go outside of Paul's own writings and to inject foreign conceptions to explain this relationship. Here is a conception which brings Christ into far more intimate relation to the believer than that between the Son of Man and the elect. Now those passages of Paul's writings which have to do with the believer being σὺν Χριστῷ would have their adequate explanation from Schweitzer's view of the fellowship of the elect with the Messiah.

1. Jesus possibly avoided the use of the term Messiah because of its political connotation.

2. Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der N. T. Theologie, V. II, p. 124. This section follows somewhat Holtzmann's argument (pp. 105 ff.), although it was derived independently. While my original form is retained, revision has been necessary in the light of Holtzmann's more mature and scholarly work.

But it fails to give an explanation for this more intimate relationship.

However, the relation of Son of Man (בן אדם) or אדם to the Greek (άνθρωπος) and thence to Adam may have occurred to Paul. At least such has been suggested.¹ There seems to be evidence of the probability that Paul knew of the term Son of Man as applied to the Messiah from his use of Psalm 8, which has reference to the "Son of Man" in relation to the Christ (I Cor. 15: 27). He may have used the term as applied to a myth of a second Adam or "Urmensch" which seems to have been current in Hellenistic Jewish circles if we may judge from Philo,² the Persian literature, and possibly from Jewish circles where apocalypticism predominated.³ There is no trace of the idea as it is in I Corinthians 15: 45, 50, in the earlier Rabbinic literature so far as it is now available.⁴ In any case, the pre-existence of the heavenly man is thus most significantly explained.

1. J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, p. 374; also R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 349.

2. Op. mundi 134; Leg. alleg. I, 31. Cf. J. Weiss, Op. cit., pp. 375-376.

3. J. Weiss, Op. cit., p. 375. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., pp. 13, 349. Cf. W. Bousset, Haupt-probleme der Gnosis p. 200 f. He holds that I Enoch Ch. 71 represents Enoch in his translation as becoming the "Urmensch"; cf. II Enoch 22: 6 ff; 67: 2.

4. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. III, 477-478. Of course it is impossible to know what excisions were made due to Jewish opposition to the Church after 70 A.D.

Although certain forms of Paul's doctrine seem to conform to contemporaneous thought, possibly the Mandaean,¹ he is far from conceding to the content of that thought. Paul makes it plain that the primary relation of Adam on the one hand, and Christ on the other to humanity is primarily a spiritual-ethical one. The metaphysical and the spiritual-ethical are for Paul identical, in the sense that the spiritual-ethical bears the metaphysical within it.² The Christ-mysticism of Paul is quite another from that of the Mandaeans as described by Reitzenstein: "Nach ihr ruht in jedem Gläubigen der himmlische Mensch (Adam) und muss nur erweckt werden und wach bleiben, um der Auferstehung sicher zu sein."³ The believer is in Christ a "new creation: the old things are passed away; behold they are become new." (II Cor. 5: 17; cf. Gal. 4: 19, 6:17). The raising of Jesus from the dead is a new creative act of God, which happens to those who are of his lineage, by faith, similarly as the creation of Adam is perpetuated in the reproduction of the human race. (I Cor. 15: 45-49).

This contrast of the two Adams carries within it the germs of Paul's whole gospel of life. On the one side,

1. The uncertainty of Mandaean origins has already been indicated above. cf. also F. Büchsel, Zeitschrift für N.T. Wissenschaft, Band 26, Heft. 2-4, pp. 219 ff.

2. A. Schweitzer, Op. cit., p. 386.

3. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 349. In the same way Paul's view differs materially from Philo's idea of the "ideal humanity" which he derives from the first account of Man's creation in Genesis 1: 27. The second Adam (2:7) is thus the progenitor of the race. Op. Mundi 134. Cf. also H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 165f.

Adam, sin, and death are inseparably linked together; on the other, Christ, righteousness, and life. Above them both is God who has ordained them for His own ends, "For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all" (Rom. 11: 32).

Paul begins his thought, as is evidenced in Romans, with man's present estrangement from God. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Rom. 1: 18). This condition of man in sin and apart from God is "without excuse" because God manifested Himself to them (Rom. 1: 19). From this Paul launches into a description of the wickedness of that day, following somewhat the Jewish polemic against the Gentiles as it was current in his day.¹ He concludes his description of the perversion of humanity by attributing to men the consciousness of the ordinance of God "that they that practise such things are worthy of death" (Rom. 1: 32). The connection of the "wrath of God" with "death" makes it apparent that Paul is thinking of death in its eschatological connotation as the state of those who will be condemned in the final judgment.² Death signifies to Paul more than physical disintegration when associated with sin,³ yet the physical death was no doubt present in his mind as the first

1. Wisdom of Solomon, Ch. 13-15.

2. J. Denney, Romans, pp. 591-592.

3. Cf. T.C. Edwards, First Corinthians, p. 412.

stage which is sin's due. This is indicated in Paul's connection of death with Adam's sin which brought death to his posterity, even those "who had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression" (Rom. 5: 14).

It is apparent that behind the thought of Paul is the belief, which is likewise contained in the Old Testament, that the one immortal principle and source of life is God.¹ Paul is here standing with Jesus who also bases his argument for the resurrection of the dead on the communion of the patriarchs with a God who is the God of the living and not the dead (Mk. 12: 26, 27). Therefore, communion and fellowship with God is life; and separation from God is death (Eph. 4: 18). (Ezekiel 18: 4, Gen. 2: 17.)² Finally, that principle which separates man from God and brings him to death is sin. Although sin was originally an act of disobedience (Rom. 5: 18, 19) and perversion of the mind and will, it has now become so deeply rooted in humanity as to be a principle of the flesh (Rom. 7: 18; cf. Rom. 3: 10). While Jesus holds that sin is the perversion of the heart and will (Mk. 7: 21; Matt. 12: 33 ff). Paul, possibly under the influence of Hellenistic thought, takes

1. Cf. H.A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, p. 107; R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 864.

2. J. Denney, Romans, p. 627: "The connection of sin and death was a commonplace of Jewish teaching, resting apparently on a literal interpretation of Gen. 3."

the added step.

In Adam's disobedience begins the reign of sin and death (Rom. 5: 14). It is difficult to determine here whether Paul's thought follows that of the contemporaneous writer of the Apocalypse of Baruch who says, "Each one is Adam to his own soul," (54: 19), or the author of Fourth Ezra who sees in the sin of Adam an evil which has been communicated to his posterity (IV Ezra 3: 20-22).¹ In Romans 5: 12 the expression ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, "on the ground that all sinned" would indicate that each man was Adam to his own soul. On the other hand, in vs. 14 death is said to have reigned, "even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, which is a figure of him that was to come." Therefore the consequences of Adam's sin has come, even upon those who did not themselves follow in his transgression. The following verse likewise connects the trespass of one to the death of the many. Paul seems to be arguing from what is empirically true, that is, that all died, to the logical cause of it, the entrance of sin into the world by the first man. Since all are sinning (Rom. 3: 10) and are subject to death, the

1. Cf. C. Gore, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 193, who shows that the idea of death because of Adam's sin first appears in IV Ezra which is later than Paul's writings. This does not preclude the conception beginning already in Paul's day. Already in the Apocalypse of Baruch premature death is due to Adam's sin, (23: 4).

cause must be Adam's transgression which brought the curse of death. Probably another force enters into his logic and that is his interest in making Adam central in the entrance of sin into the race, so as to center attention on the Second Adam who brings righteousness and life. He makes his purpose clear in verse 15 when the "trespass of the one" is contrasted with "the gift by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ."

Just as estrangement from God through disobedience, leading to God's sentence of death, came upon mankind through Adam's act of transgression; so likewise fellowship with God in His reign of righteousness, with the consequent restoration of life, is secured by an act of righteousness of the Second Adam, Christ (Rom. 5: 18). Reconciliation as the message of the gospel becomes clear in Paul's use of the term "word of reconciliation" for it (II Cor. 5: 19). The act of reconciliation was an act on God's part which was done through Jesus Christ (5: 18) and which is extended to mankind through His ministers. In fact, a man's being a new creation in Christ is based on the reconciliation wrought through Christ (5: 17, 18).

This reconciliation which brings life is an act of God's grace, or favor. Paul can therefore say that eternal life is the free gift from God in Jesus Christ (Rom. 6: 23),

and that grace shall "reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 5: 21). It is noteworthy that in each of these instances Christ is the medium through whom eternal life is bestowed, yet this life is attributed to the grace (undeserved favor) of God. In one instance the free gift is attributed both to the grace of God and to the grace of Christ (Rom. 5: 15). The conception of life as a gift through Christ must have come from Paul's idea of the pre-existent heavenly man,¹ who is Messiah and son of God (as discussed above), and who is sent upon the earth to perform the act of redemption. God sends forth his son to be born of a woman under the law in order to redeem them that were under the law (Gal. 4: 4). Paul argues from this benevolence of God in that he "Spared not His own son" to His generosity in all things - so wonderful has it appeared to Paul in his experience of grace in the risen Christ (Rom. 8: 32). Therefore, when Paul is describing life alternately, as a consequence of God's grace and of God's righteousness, he is thinking of Christ's act of righteousness bringing men the new life which God bestowed upon sinful men by sending Christ in their behalf. The gospel is therefore good news, both of God's righteousness

1. Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der N. T. Theologie, Vol. II, p. 93 f.

and of His grace.¹

How, then, is this reconciliation effected? The logic of Paul is very simple. If estrangement from God and the consequent death thereby is due to disobedience, reconciliation and life must be due to obedience (Eph. 2: 14-16). If the disobedience and death were of such a nature as to be passed on to the rest of mankind, so the obedience, or act of righteousness and life must be of that nature. Obedience furthermore had to be performed in relation to mankind in its present disobedient and sinful condition. For that reason Jesus came in the flesh in its sinful state (Rom. 8: 3). Now, the singular paradox, the foolishness of the gospel consists in this, that Christ's obedience consisted in obeying God's law with respect to sin: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18: 20). Thus, the obedience of Jesus to God consists not only in a righteous life which may have secured eternal life for himself, but the obedience which fulfilled God's law of doom upon the sinner. The complete act as Paul finally came to see it in his last days in prison was, first the humiliation of the heavenly Christ in taking on the form of a man

1. H.J. Holtzmann rightly sees that hereby Paul resolves the conflict between the God of righteousness and the God of benevolence and grace, Lehrbuch der N. T. Theologie, V. 2, p. 118.

(δουλος, servant), and then His obedience to the death of the cross (Phil. 2: 5-8).¹ Out of this circumstance comes the strange paradox that one who was not a sinner fulfilled the law of death-to-the-sinner and thereby made it the law of life.

Paul relates this paradoxical conception of the death of Christ to the sinner when he says, "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin in our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him" (II Cor. 5: 21). The one supreme act of righteousness which brought to men as doomed sinners a righteousness whereby they could have eternal life is the death of Jesus on the cross. "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life" (Rom. 5: 18). The act of righteousness is, of course, Jesus' conformity to the law of death-for-sin whereby he relates himself to the sinner in rendering his sinful condition righteous. Yet Paul makes it clear that Jesus' obedience to the law of death-for-sin is only efficacious as a part of his obedience to the whole law of God (II Cor. 5: 21). Obedience to the whole law of God would bring life to him who fulfilled it completely (Rom. 2: 12, 13). Anything less would not have

1. Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Op. cit., p. 120.

sufficed. Therefore, the obedience which Jesus rendered was required to fulfill the law, but its special efficacy was in this, that not only did He fulfill the law of the righteous man but He also fulfilled the law of death-for-sin on behalf of the sinner to bring life to him (Rom. 5: 8, 9, Phil. 2: 5-8).¹

The expression "justification unto life" (Rom. 5: 18) is greatly simplified when this new conception of Jesus' righteousness is made clear. No more clearly can this law be put than Paul has revealed it in the words, "For he that hath died (ἀποθανών) is justified (δικαίωται) from sin" (Rom. 6: 7). "For the death that he died he died unto sin once; but the life that he liveth he liveth unto God" (Rom. 6: 10).² It is further made plain that **Justification by Christ** was of this kind when it is described as a "justification by his blood" (ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ) (Rom. 5: 9). The intimate relation of this act of Christ and the justification of the sinner appears in the statement: "he who was delivered up on account of (διὰ) our trespasses and was raised on account of (διὰ) our justification" (Rom. 4: 25). Whatever be the interpretation of

1. This is also contained in the sacrifice conception in Paul which required that a lamb without blemish be offered; (Lev. 14: 10), cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Op. cit., p. 111 f.

2. Cf. J. Denney, Romans, p. 634 "Christ by dying paid to sin that tribute to which in virtue of a Divine sentence ... it could lay claim" Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Op. cit., p. 128.

of this passage, it is clear that the justification by Jesus' death and resurrection, was necessary only because of the sinfulness of humanity; and that the justification is not merely God's acquittal of Jesus, but also God's acquittal of the sinner, together with the vindication of his right thereby to a resurrection of his own.

How, then, is this justification which secures the resurrection life communicated to the sinner? Perhaps the matter is put most clearly in the contrast of Christ and Adam. As in the act of the transgression of Adam, the sentence of death rested upon all men; so, too, in the act of righteousness of Christ, the acquittal that brings life comes to all men (Rom. 5: 18).¹ Adam and Christ are viewed as representatives of the two existing relations of men to God.² The one is the sin-separation-death relationship; the other is the justification-reconciliation-life relationship. Ideally speaking, with the death and resurrection of Christ, the old separation-from-God relationship is abrogated, and the new era of reconciliation and life has begun. So far as God's sentence upon man for Adam's sin is concerned, it has been abrogated, and God has declared his acquittal. The new reign of righteousness and life is to replace the old reign of sin and death (5: 17, 21).

1. Contr. J. Denney, Romans, p. 630, whose argument seems to me to violate the text in the interest of consistency. But cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der N. T. Theologie, p. 120, V. II.

2. Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Op. cit., p. 124.

Theoretically all men are justified by Jesus' act of righteousness. In practise, Paul sees that they are very much sinners. Paul has not only to treat with the fact of Adam's transgression which has brought condemnation upon men, but also with man's corrupt nature which had been brought on by the sin that has possession of what Paul calls the flesh or body of sin (Rom. 6: 6, 8: 7). But Paul takes account of this when he sees in the death of Christ, not only the fulfillment of God's law of death-for-sin, but the putting to death once for all of sin in the flesh (Rom. 8: 3).¹ In this case, Christ's death is offered, not only as the grounds for God's acquittal and restoration to favor with the promise of life, but it is offered as an annulment of the power of sin and the corruption of the flesh.

The metaphysical aspect of this annulment of the body of sin and the raising of the new body through Christ becomes the theme of the resurrection section of First Corinthians. Here, the corruptible body of the first Adam is contrasted with the incorruptible spiritual body of the Second Adam (I Cor. 15: 45-47). The process through which this change occurs is likened to the seed which "is not quickened except it die So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption" (I. Cor. 15: 36, 42). Paul argues that what Christ has done in his death and resurrection is the law of the resurrection life of the believer.

1. Cf. W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 14.

THE PARTICIPATION IN ETERNAL LIFE BY FAITH.

How is the entrance into this new life of reconciliation to God and participation in this heavenly humanity realized? While from the God-ward side, the entrance is represented as a divine appointment (Rom. 8:29,30), from the manward side it is realized by faith. The participation in life by faith is set over against the failure to participate in it by works (Rom. 3:27). It is the contrast between seeking to procure the favorable will of God by human acts and by trusting his benevolent promises toward men as His favorable will, (Rom. 4:19-22).¹ Now the contrast of faith and works must be presupposed, in order to distinguish between the righteousness which is by faith and the righteousness which is by works, both of which are methods by which reconciliation to God is sought. This righteousness therefore is not an act of human merit as the grounds of man's acquittal by God (II Cor. 5:21, Rom. 3:23-25), but represents the act from the human side, which alone can secure for the believer the righteousness of Christ which God offers for his acquittal. This same kind of faith was exhibited by Abraham when he received as

1. O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, Vol. I, p. 165 f.

true God's promise of the perpetuation of the Hebrew race through him (Rom. 4:13 ff.) Thus Abraham is the progenitor of this kind of faith to such of his followers as exhibit it (Gal. 3:7). In this conception of faith, Paul lays the stress on the fact that righteousness consists primarily in trust, apart from any claim in Him who justifies. Faith, in general, is holding for true merely on the ethical ground of trust in God, and confidence in God's truth, power, and honor (Rom. 4:3), but specifically, it is "holding it to be true that God raised Christ from the dead"¹ - him who died for us (Rom. 3:22-26, 4:24-25, Gal. 2:16 f.). Therefore, while the inheritance of Adam is an inheritance by kinship, that of Christ is one by faith (Rom. 9:8; Gal. 3:22-29, esp. vs. 26; cf. Heb. 6:12). With respect to God's vindication of the believer, faith is the acceptance of Christ's death for sin and his resurrection as a promise of God's acquittal and resurrection of the believer (I Cor. 15:20-23).

Because of Paul's high conception of faith, it means far more to him than mere assent. This acceptance of God's act becomes the new basis for living, for like Jesus, Paul regards this life as lived now in direct trust and

1. O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, V. I, p. 162.

reliance upon God. True faith effects a change not only of mind but also of heart and will, because belief from the heart is required for righteousness to be effective for salvation resulting in eternal life (Rom.10:9, 10). Hence this faith as the ground of obedience is spoken of in relation to Paul's apostleship, as an "obedience of faith among all the Gentiles" (Rom.1:5,16:26).¹ As Pfleiderer remarks:

"In this absolute surrender of the whole man to God, faith is certainly the most complete fulfilment of the will of God, but, be it well understood, not (in the first instance) of that will which demands the fulfilment of the law, but of the will which bestows favour, of that will which has substituted for the old economy of the law, with its demands and performances, the new economy of grace with its gift of favour, and now requires nothing from men with respect to this new religious principle but the behaviour which corresponds to it - a trustful acceptance of the gift of favour offered by God." ²

Therefore, not only is the believer put in the relation of recipient of God's favour, but this trustful relationship makes him a servant of God and obedient to the new righteousness into which he has entered. Becoming a recipient of God's righteousness means further belonging to God - becoming a son to Him (Rom.8:14,15; Gal.3:26). But the believer as son must trust and obey the teaching which delivered him and showed him the way of righteousness.

1. O. Pfleiderer, Op. cit., p. 164 f.

2. O. Pfleiderer, Op. cit., p. 165.

If freedom from sin is to come, it must be realized in the service of righteousness. What, then, is the difference between obeying righteousness in the law, and the righteousness of faith? In the one case a man is serving for wages, in the other he serves righteousness in view of an acquittal freely bestowed upon him as son. The service of sin is in this respect similar to the service of the law (Rom. 6:17-23; cf. 7:9-11; II Cor. 5:15).

The most important aspect however, whereby faith brings newness of life to the believer is the union of the believer with Christ. Now the mystical is also included in the representative and eschatological aspects of this relationship.¹ "Just as in Adam (ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ) all die (ἀποθνῄσκειν) so also in Christ (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ) shall all be made alive (ζωοποιήσονται)."¹ (I Cor. 15:22). The difficulty with the "all" (πάντες) is modified when the next verse is read, "But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits then they that are Christ's (i.e. all who are in Christ) at his coming." This may allow

1. Cf. F. C. Porter, The Mind of Christ in Paul, pp. 251 ff. J. Weiss, on the other hand, makes too definite a cleavage between the mystical and representative aspect in Paul, although he admits the mystical in II Cor. 5:17, I Cor. 1:30, I Thess. 3:8, and Phil. 4:1, 13. Weiss' classification is helpful but fails to allow for the overflow of the meaning of terms so necessary to the understanding of Paul. J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, Note 2, p. 359 f. For the representative aspect, cf. G. G. Findlay, First Corinthians p. 926 (E. G. T.).

the meaning of the former verse to suggest that, "Just as all who are in Adam are (!) dying, so also all who are in Christ will be made alive." Adam and Christ in addition to being the names of persons, are also spheres of existence. This is confirmed in Paul's argument further on in this chapter. "The first man is of (ἐξ) the earth, earthy; the second man¹ is of (ἐξ) heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (I Cor. 15: 47-49). It is evident that Adam here represents the sphere of the earthy or fleshly man (vs. 50) into which his posterity has entered so that they are "in Adam." Similarly Christ represents the sphere of the heavenly man into which the believers enter by faith so that they are "in Christ." Thus, just as those who are "in Adam" themselves repeat the transgression of Adam and are subject to death, (Rom. 5:12), so likewise those who are "in Christ" repeat the act of dying to sin in the flesh and being raised to the spiritual life of righteousness with God.

1. Om. ὁ Κύριος \mathfrak{N}^* B C D G etc. Ins. \mathfrak{N} A D K L P etc.

2. Cf. A. Schweitzer, Op. cit., p.118. "The corporeity, which is common to Christ and the Elect is called the Body of Christ by reference to the most exalted personality which shares in it." But this is hardly adequate to explain his later statement that the believer is "only a form of the manifestation of the personality of Jesus Christ which dominates that corporeity," p. 125. Cf. O. Pfleiderer, Op. cit., Vol. I, p.204.

Paul's analogy whereby through likeness to Adam on the one hand, and likeness to Christ on the other, a man becomes "in Adam" or "in Christ", is an important one to observe. Paul thereby precludes any thought of Christ as a kind of depersonalized heavenly corporeity into which the believer comes by a sacramental act. Herein, again, it may be said that while Paul uses forms of expression similar to those of the mystery religions, his sacramental ideas differ radically from those of the mysteries whose "average communicant believed that in some realistic, hyper-physical sense the sacrament was an occasion on which or means by which he was privileged to have fellowship with the divine life."¹ In all of Paul's mysticism there is constantly kept before him to a greater or less degree the personality of the Christ sphere, so that the faith relationship is usually kept to the fore, even in the sacraments, (Gal. 3:25-27; I Cor. 12:13).² Therefore, baptism is regarded as an act performed with Christ as well as into Christ (Rom. 6:3,4) by which the believer enters into death with him, so putting to death the body of sin and living a

1. S. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 132.

2. Cf. H. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 219. Also Paul's opposition to eating sacrifices to demons is against the tribute to demons and not the meat itself (I Cor. 10:19,20), cf. pp. 118,119.

new life (Rom.6:4-11). That this is a union of imitation is apparent from the words: "For if we have become united with the likeness of his death we shall also be in the likeness of his resurrection" (Rom.6:5). But while the sacrament of baptism is thus an imitation of the death and resurrection of Christ, the imitation of Christ's death¹ is made efficacious in a risen life by faith in the God who raised Jesus from the dead (Col. 2:12). In much the same way, the participation in the Lord's Supper (I Cor. 11:17 ff.) is participation in that which is purely symbolic, so that "the bread and wine represent not the flesh and blood of Christ as such, but His human person as slain on the Cross."² There is no eating the flesh or drinking the blood in Paul.³ Again here, the efficacy of the act depends upon the discernment (διακρίνω) of Christ's body by the believer without which he is condemned with those who are of the world (I Cor. 11:29, 32). Thus for Paul the sacramental act is a symbolical⁴ mode of affirming the believer's faith-relationship with the risen Christ.⁵

1. Cf. R.H.Strachan, Second Corinthians, p.109, "A real imitatio Christi." Cf. II Cor. 5:15.

2. H.A.Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p.270.

3. Ibid., p. 270; cf. A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, p. 198.

4. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 81.

5. For the baptism for the dead, cf. J. Denney, Romans (EGT), pp. 930, 931.

Another important aspect is to be noticed in the mysticism of Paul. The being-in-Christ is almost always represented by him as the believer's union with the risen Christ, while the dying of the believer is represented as "with Christ" in all except one or two doubtful instances (Col.2:11, Rom 6:3). Such exceptions indicate the difficulty in deriving a consistent doctrine from Paul's teaching. Although the rising of the believer is sometimes represented as "with Christ" the term "in Christ" is almost exclusively applied to the believer's new life after the death of the old.¹ Life "in Christ" begins at the point of complete self and world-negation represented by a crucifixion with Christ.² At this point of complete self-negation when the self is nothing, Christ is raised both with and in the believer and becomes everything. At this point a new creation (II Cor. 5:16,17) takes place. The self-Ego has changed over to the Christ-Ego and the heavenly man is taking shape (Gal.4:19). This is precisely the experience which Paul had undergone and there is no doubt a trace of this experience in Galatians 2:20 in which he sets forth so clearly this process. "I have been crucified with

1. Rom. 6:4,8; Col. 2:12,20; Gal. 2:20.

2. Cf. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 870.

Christ," says Paul of his self-negation in fellowship with Christ in imitation of Him. But now his life is not simply a fellowship with or imitation of Christ for "it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." (ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἔτι ἐγώ, ἡ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός). Christ occupies the place of the Ego.¹ Significantly enough, this is exactly the place which the Χριστός occupies with relation to the ἐγώ in the Greek.

Paul further indicates that this mystical union with Christ in the life which he now lives in the flesh is "in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself up for me." Pfleiderer has indicated the parallel between "Christ liveth in me" and "I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me. He continues:

"This passage is especially instructive for this very reason, that it allows us to see the inner point of unity between faith in the sense of trustful acceptance, and the deep mystical notion of faith. This unity lies in the grateful love which is absolutely inseparable from entire trust; and we can now understand why Paul, above all others, arrived at this deep notion of faith."²

Christ in the believer is the completion of the dying-to-live process, if not actually at least ideally. In

1. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 125.

2. O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, V.I., p. 168; cf. A. Schweitzer, Op.cit., p. 125.

practise it is a process of Christ being formed within the believer (Gal.4:19). The present ethical life of righteousness is lived from the new position of faith (II Cor. 13:5 ff). There is a new life in the Spirit as a consequence of the death of the old body of sin (Rom.8:10). The new Ego, Christ, so controls the life that the believer can say, "To me to live is Christ" and his whole concern is that "Christ shall be magnified in (his) body whether by life, or by death." (Phil. 1:21,20). This same conception is presented in the reverse formula, the believer in Christ. According to this conception Christ governs the whole of the believer's living. He speaks the truth in Christ (Rom.9:1, I Tim.2:7); he is wise in Christ (I Cor. 4:10); his relationship with his brethren is in Christ (Rom. 12:5; II Cor. 1:21); he is triumphant in his ministry in Christ (II Cor. 2:14); when he is in bonds his bonds are in Christ (Phil. 1:13); he is comforted in Christ (Phil. 2:1): in fact all of his ways are in Christ, (I Tim. 4:17).¹ "I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13).

This new life within the believer is a growth, beginning in Christ in such a manner, that believers in the uncertain stages when they first enter the faith are called "babes in Christ" (I Cor. 3:1). Through the spiritual labors of the

1. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 124.

apostle, Christ is being formed in the believers (Gal. 4:19). The apostle himself testifies that he is renewed in the inner man day by day (II Cor. 4:16). The unification of the brethren in the faith and the knowledge of Christ is pursued with the view of attaining the "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13), both for the group as a whole and for the individual as well; so that they become "no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, but speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, who is the head, even Christ" (4:14,15).

The life in Christ is always lived in hope. It is the hope of those who have died in Christ (I Cor. 15:17,18) for a resurrection. It is the assurance of the heavenly blessings which will be the heritage of the believer in the "fulness of the times" (τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν) in Christ. Faith in Christ and love for the saints by the believer takes place in view of the hope which is laid up for him in the heavens (Col. 1:4-6). Thus Christ in the believer, the hope of glory, is already a sign of the Messianic era (Col. 1:27). The life lived in Christ is not only lived unto God (Rom. 6:11), but it is even said to be a life "hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3). Indeed the suffering of the present life for the gospel's sake is conceived as "bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be

manifested in our body" (II Cor. 4:10, 6:9). As alive from the dead in Christ, the believer lives his life henceforth only for God who is his hope (Rom. 6:11,13; 12:1; Gal. 2:19; II Cor. 5:15).

The gift of Christ is the gift of life since he has brought life and incorruption to light (II Tim. 1:10); he has himself conquered death whereby the believer has been reconciled and is saved (Rom. 5:10), assuring the believer's resurrection with Christ in glory. Hence the believer is said to belong to Christ (Gal. 3:29, 5:24). The centrality of Christ can only be accounted for by the centrality of the experience of Christ which Paul has had in his own life since he repeatedly refers to his own experience in his representation to believers of the meaning of the new spiritual life. (Phil. 1:20, Gal. 2:19, Rom. 8:2, etc.).

Pauline thought in these passages is in some respects closely akin to that of Jesus. Both Paul and Jesus have the conception of "dying to live." Both center the true life and the righteousness which is related to it in God and His mercy. Both look for eternal life coming in its fullest sense at the consummation.

The differences in the Pauline thought are accounted for by the two factors: the one is the resurrection experience, the other is the Hellenistic influence. Thus, for Jesus, the

dying to live was probably regarded primarily as the result of opposition to his Messianic movement and the consequent penalty and reward of the realization of the Kingdom of God. (Mk 8: 34-38; 10: 29-31). As Schweitzer has pointed out, in the case of Paul the dying to live is really the annulment of the believer's sin in the flesh through his joining with Christ by faith in the crucifixion of his sin in the flesh.¹ But it occurs on the basis of the justifying death and resurrection of Christ (Col. 2:13, 15: Eph. 4:32).

With Jesus, forgiveness is the free gift which comes from a gracious father to him who repents and turns wholly to him. It is the discovery and restoration of the sinner who was lost but is found, was dead but is alive again (Lk. 15:24, cf. vs. 3-32).² The forgiving spirit of man induces the forgiveness of God toward him (Matt. 6:12-15). There seems to be no intervening grounds of forgiveness, simply the call for mercy (Lk. 18:13). For Paul, forgiveness is in Christ (Eph. 4:32, Col. 1:14), even in his blood (Eph. 1:7). It may however be assumed that Jesus adhered to the Mosaic ritual of atonement (Lk. 17:13), although he sometimes protested

1. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 221, 222.

2. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 310 ff. That the authority attributed to the "Son of Man" to forgive sins was meant originally to designate the claim for Jesus is extremely doubtful. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 214.

against the substitution of sacrifices for mercy (Matt. 9:13). In the same manner as Jesus, Paul uses the term "eternal life" to denote the life after death (Rom. 2:7, 5:21, 6:23; I Tim. 6:12; Titus 1:2). But the term "life" used alone denotes the beginnings of the new life as already present with the believer,¹ so that the inner man is already prepared to survive the Parousia, although the outward physical man must be changed (I Cor. 15: 51-57; II Cor. 5:1-8). The "earnest of the Spirit" is already in the believer insuring his present connection with the resurrection (II Cor. 5:5 ff.). The resurrection of Christ has already initiated the life to come by opening the channel of the spirit and power of God to mankind. This conception was of course hardly possible in the actual preaching of Jesus, although in his person these powers were being released.

LIFE THROUGH THE SPIRIT.

The doctrine of the Spirit in Paul's teaching moves from the Old Testament conception to one which is somewhat Hellenized²

1. R. Bultmann rightly indicates that this life is never shut up in time but is conceived as having its end in the higher spiritual life. Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., Band II, Lief. 14, p.870.

2. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 420.

in form although with marked differences in content.¹ It sometimes carries the idea of the prophetic gift of a higher order (Isa. 57:16 f), and indeed such manifestations as are to be found in Samuel (I Sam. 10:6, 9-13; I Cor. 13: 1-17). However, the highest conception of the Spirit in the Old Testament is contained in the fifty-first Psalm:

"Create in me a clean heart, O God;
And renew a right spirit within me.
Cast me not away from thy presence;
And take not thy holy Spirit from me.
Restore unto me the joy of thy Salvation;
And uphold me with a willing spirit." (Ps. 51: 10-12).

Similarly, in the Pauline writings the Spirit of God is a sanctifying spirit (I Cor. 6:11), and sin in the life of the believer is said to grieve the Holy Spirit of God (Eph. 4:30). The ethical life of the believer is the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22).²

Paul's link both with Jesus and the Old Testament is the common conviction that the Spirit of God exists in the proclamation of his message. His preaching is not by words of wisdom but by the demonstration of the Spirit (I Cor. 2:4; cf. Lk. 4:18 ff.). His proclaimed word is the Word of God with the supernatural power of God "unto salvation to everyone

1. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 868

2. Cf. H.A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 34 ff.; A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 294.

that believes" (Romans 1:16). As in the Primitive Church, it is known to Paul as the "word of life" (Phil. 1:15,16a; cf. Acts 5:20). The word is the channel through which the Spirit spreads abroad life so that Paul and his fellow labourers as ministers of the word are also ministers of life, (II Cor. 2:15-17; 3:6-18; 5:18-20).¹ This word of life is not a timeless, mythically clothed truth, not simply knowledge which is imparted to the hearer; it is the proclamation of an historical event (thus distinguishing it from Gnostic or Stoic forms of imparting the new life) affirming to the individual the active grace of God in this saving event.²

With the resurrection of Christ, the power of God had been released to the Christian community, and the Messianic era had begun. In the words of Schweitzer:

"What ordinary beliefs regarded as a miracle of the pre-Messianic times becomes for him (Paul) an essential event of the Messianic time. His conviction, that with the resurrection of Jesus the supernatural world period had begun, makes itself felt in his thinking in all directions, and determines also his conception of the Spirit. Paul thus inevitably comes to see in the Spirit an efflorescence of the Messianic glory within the natural world."³

Therefore the life and existence of the Christian community had their power from the power of the resurrection (II Cor.

1. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 869. For parallels in Persian thought, cf. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., pp. 394 ff.

2. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., p. 869.

3. A. Schweitzer, Op. cit., p. 166.

13: 3 ff). On this resurrection of Christ was founded the resurrection of the believers (I Cor. 6:14, Phil. 3:10). Here was the miraculous supernatural act of God exhibited in an historical act to all mankind and effective through the Spirit (Rom. 8:11, II Cor. 1:22, I Cor. 15:45-49).¹ Paul nevertheless conserves the picture which Jesus had given his followers of the coming of the Son of Man in power (II Thess. 1:7; cf. Mark 9:1), and the consequent destruction of all enemy forces, and the final supremacy of Christ's lordship (Phil. 3:21). However, already, in the resurrection, the victory of God and his Christ over death had occurred.

Because this power originates from God through Christ in the resurrection, Paul can use the terms Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ, and Christ as identical (Rom. 8:9-11).² It is thus a kind of "transcendent physical essence" of the heavenly order which conveys the qualities of eternity, purity, holiness, and power to persons who possess it. (Rom. 5:5, II Cor. 4:6, I Cor. 15:42-50).³ Paul would agree with the Primitive Church that the Spirit had miraculous powers which it manifested upon earth (Acts 2:6-19, 10:46, 19:6; cf.

1. W. Grundmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T., Band II, Lief. 5, p. 305 ff.

2. W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 24; cf. C. Gore, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 285.

3. O. Pfleiderer, Op. cit., p. 201. Cf. S. Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, p. 140.

I Cor. 12; Gal. 3:5). But its chief work is in purifying believers for the new life (I Cor. 6:11). Such is the effect produced in those who are in Christ (Rom. 8:10). Christ and Spirit must therefore have been interchangeable in the mind of Paul when he wrote: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother (husband): else were your children unclean; but now they are holy" (I Cor. 7:14). How is this sanctification conveyed? Paul argues that "your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit" (6:19), therefore bodily connection with the believer conveys the sanctifying Spirit, both to the partner and the children as well who spring from that union. In the same way Paul argues that since the bodies of believers are members of Christ "intercourse with a harlot is ruinous, because thereby a union is established which necessarily annuls the existence of union with Christ" (I Cor. 6:13-19).¹ Thus, as Schweitzer says further, "The metaphysical and the spiritual-ethical are for Paul identical, in the sense that the spiritual-ethical bears the metaphysical within it."²

The most general effect produced by the Spirit is life, life in the eschatological sense first of all (I Cor. 15:45),

1. A. Schweitzer, Op. cit., pp. 128, 129.

2. Ibid., p. 386. Cf. however H. Kennedy, Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 810.

and then, also, combined with it life in the spiritual-ethical sense (Rom. 8:8 ff.). The Spirit is thus opposed both to the flesh (Rom. 8:6), and to the law (II Cor. 3:6). Here again the intimate relation in the mind of Paul between righteousness and incorruption in eternal life makes itself apparent. Eternal life must possess freedom from the taint of sin in order to retain its incorruption. Only so can the eighth chapter of Romans be understood. And there too is the indication that Paul believes that eternal life "is already present in the life of Christians on this side of the grave, as an immediate inward possession of the spirit."¹ It is evidenced in the believer in a mind of "life and peace" (Rom. 8:6). In fact, the eschatological aspect can hardly be separated from the present. It is ever in the mind of Paul as on the verge of consummation, and the ultimate ethical quality of life in the presence of God must be present in whatever measure it is now in the believer. This may account for the reason for the two ideas being present together.¹

The most notable manifestations of the Spirit are therefore ethical. The spiritual life is not something individually self-contained. It is in a measure existing

1. O. Pfleiderer, Op. cit., Vol. I., p. 207; Rom. 8:10.

only in the possibilities of the believer's existence, mediated through faith and as yet unrealized.¹ It begins here and ends with God. Nor does it exist as a man's possession apart from God or the brethren, for the group possession of the Spirit is also strikingly reiterated (Rom. 8:8,9; Eph. 3:11-16). Nevertheless it effects freedom for the believer from the law which resulted in death (Rom. 7:10, Gal. 3:12 f., II Cor. 3:17, Gal. 5:1). This freedom is life, since it is freedom from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2). But freedom from sin means the service of righteousness with "fruit unto sanctification and the end eternal life" (Rom. 6:18, 22). The way of righteousness is made known and empowered by the Spirit so that the believer in submitting to it lives his life accordingly (Rom. 8:4, Gal. 5:25). Yet responsibility exists not only for the believer's individual life when he is thus guided by the Spirit, but he also becomes responsible for the life of the brethren (Gal. 5:25-6: 3).

In setting the norm of action for the new spiritual life on an inward basis as against the outward basis of the Law, Paul is in conformity with Jesus in his ethic. The norms of a man's conduct are in the heart or inner man, and there a man is either for God or opposed to God

1. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Bd. II, Lief. 14, p. 870.

(Rom. 8:5-9, Gal. 5:16-18; cf. Mk. 7:5-23, vs.5 - "Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders ..?" cf. Gal. 5:16 "Walk in the spirit ..."). It is true that the Law demanded inward obedience as well as outward, but it is to be distinguished in that its norms were derived from a code which defined what a man must do but left him not only helpless but rebellious toward the keeping of it (Rom. 7:7-13). The Law left the will ultimately unregenerated. The Spirit however seeks the whole loyalty and obedience of the inner man, rendering him at the center free by its destruction of the principle of sin in the flesh and empowered to obey God. (Gal. 5:13-25, Eph. 3:16, Rom. 8:14,15). However, Paul exhorts his brethren, as if they are constantly faced with this decision to yield themselves to the Spirit, so that the decision has to be repeatedly reaffirmed by the believer (Rom. 6:12, 8:13; Gal. 5:16). The work which Christ has done for the believer does not set aside his responsibility for availing himself of what God has done in his behalf.

Paul also approaches the position of Jesus in regarding these ethical manifestations of the Spirit as signs of the presence of the Kingdom. As Gardner remarks:

"In Romans xiv. 17 he writes, The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. Obviously

the Apostle is here speaking of conduct and the present experience of Christians. Eating and drinking, about which some of the disciples had scruples, are declared to be in themselves indifferent; what really matters is the life in the Spirit, which life is lived in the present, on the earth."¹

The ultimate transformation of the body in the final Kingdom requires the present spiritual ethical transformation of the inner life. But the Kingdom is already present wherever this inner transformation occurs. Hence, Paul can say that the Kingdom of God is present wherever the moral and spiritual manifestations of the Spirit are present in the believer.

This inner principle controls the outer life by putting to death "the deeds of the body" (Rom. 8:13), and substituting for the stimulation of carnal vices the buoyancy of a new inner spirit (Eph. 5:18). It lends its aid in prayer, assuring the believer of reconciliation and sonship to the Father as mediator (Rom. 8:15,16,26). Special gifts are given the believers by the Spirit, special wisdom, prophecy, the miraculous power to heal and to perform other miracles, speaking in tongues and the interpretation of the same, and also the ability to use these individual gifts in subservience to the common Lord, since they are given by the one Spirit to be the expression of the body of Christ

1. P. Gardner, The Religious Experience of St. Paul, p. 131.

(I Cor. 12:4-31). Division is therefore impossible among those who are the body of Christ. Love is the one great moving uniting principle in the exercise of these gifts without which they are empty and futile (I Cor. 13). Here, Paul is at the acme of his expression of the spiritual life. Unless we have lived in some measure in the pride of race and personal achievement as Paul did, have cast them aside as we have seen them turn to ashes, have learned to be nothing so that the will of God in Christ may be all, have seen that the Christ-will must mean our actively dying in order that there may be life for others (II Cor. 4:10-12), this thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians is as "sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal." When Paul saw the mercy of God in the face of Jesus Christ, a love gripped him which taught him how to suffer long and be kind, to live without envy, never seeking his own, rejoicing in the true with utter humility yet with an active unflinching optimism in the victory of God who in His mercy allowed men the expression of His gifts. Love heads the list of the fruits of the Spirit, and one who reads the great Love Chapter might well say that it includes them all (Gal. 5:22, 23)!

CHAPTER IV

THE JOHANNINE INTERPRETATION OF LIFE.

The Johannine development of the conception of life enters upon a phase which is markedly different from either the Synoptic teaching of Jesus or the Pauline writings. Historically considered, the figure which emerges in the Gospel of John would have seemed strange to the lowly Nazarene had he known this final interpretation of his life. He who had spoken the words, "Why callest me good? there is none good save one, even God" (Mk. 10:18), is made to say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (Jno. 14:9). Although the names of the disciples remain for the most part the same, although many of the incidents despite certain embellishments may be recognized as also occurring in the Synoptic narratives, there is nevertheless an interpretation placed upon the person and events of the story which makes it in essence scarcely recognizable. Where is the baptism of Jesus, the temptation in the wilderness, the confession of Jesus as Messiah by Peter and Jesus' rebuke, the incidents of Gethsemane, and the cry of desolation on the cross?¹ Although the author is

1. F. Von Hügel, Eternal Life, p. 79 f.; cf. E. F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 34 ff.

writing a Gospel of Love, there are traces of polemic against the Jews. Wrede's observation is undoubtedly extreme when he states, "The work of Paul has borne fruit, the church has rejected Judaism, which has become far more than in Paul's time an actual enemy, and at the same time its rival Our gospel must have been written in a locality, presumably in Asia minor where this feud was violently in-flamed."¹

The author of the Fourth Gospel, like certain other Jews and Christians of his day, was vitally alive to the Greek and Persian streams of thought as well as to the Judaism of his day. No doubt Antioch² (or Ephesus) lay in the way of these influences. Thus, besides the writings of Paul and the Synoptic Gospels, there are certain streams of thought from Greek sources as represented in the Alexandrian philosophy, and also in Gnostic thought, which penetrate into the Gospel.³ Yet none of these are left in their original form, but are given a Jewish cast, partly so as to meet Jewish thought on a philosophical basis. This may account for the close resemblance between Philo's Logos,

1. P. Wrede, The Origin of the New Testament, p. 83. Cf. E. F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 70 ff. While other polemical motives are no doubt present, this seems foremost.

2. Antioch seems to be increasingly accepted by scholars as the place of the writing of the Fourth Gospel. Cf. C. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, p. 130 f., for arguments in favor of this view.

3. Cf. E. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, p. 30.

and the Hebrew Memra conceptions in the Prologue, which has caused scholars to be undecided which of the two sources accounts for the Logos idea in John's Gospel.¹ Furthermore, each of these is controlled by the author's vital living experience of the presence of the risen Christ in him. Therefore, while there is a real closeness in point of view between Johannine thought and that of the Alexandrian and Gnostic schools, this resemblance is not to be regarded as syncretism. A new point of view is presented which is a revision both of the Jewish and of the Greek concepts. This is particularly discernible with relation to the conception of life.²

THE NATURE OF ETERNAL LIFE.

Little help for the Greek conception of life embodied in this gospel can be derived from the Stoic or common Greek usage. It is the Gnostic thought, influenced in part by Persian dualism, which introduces this life as a divine entity. This life is present in the divine world and may

1. Cf. E. Scott, Ibid., pp. 58 ff.; cf. C. F. Burney The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 37 ff.

2. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T., Band II, Lief. 14, pp. 873, 874.

stream out into men. While Greek thought rejected the strict dualism of the Persians, it retained the idea of the divine life which is immortal. Magical formulas and foods were given as the 'medicine of immortality.' The drinking of or being baptized in flowing water was especially efficacious in bestowing the divine life. Finally, this water was known under the name of "the water of life."

The Gnostic literature in which the conception of life most frequently comes to the fore is the Mandaean. God is repeatedly referred to as 'Life' in contrast with the world. That which belonged to the divine world was spoken of as 'living'. Mandaism also has its "message of life", "way of life," "water of life," and "fruit of life." Life in the form of light is a divine substance which flows into the believer from the divine world. God is the source of light or life and sends this presence into the divine world. This light and life are also characteristic of the "Urmensch" who sank into the material world and mixed the divine nature with the physical.¹ Freedom from the earthly entanglement of the true man comes from knowledge of the divine Revelation, and unity or communion

1. Cf. also W. Scott, Hermetica, Vol. II, p. 4, who also points out the relation of this concept in the Hermetica to the Hebrew Adam.

with God which bestows the new birth. However, this process is non-historical, and is entirely from above. This life is realized in the believer as knowledge of God, joy, and love.¹

Odeberg stresses the use of this literature as the key to the Johannine writings,² although investigations of recent scholars tend to discredit the influence of Mandaeism on Johannine thought. Odeberg assumes the results of scholars who contend partly on philological grounds, partly through references to the Jordan, that the sect originated in Palestine possibly among the followers of John the Baptist.³ However, the contrast between the significance of the baptism of John the Baptist and the Mandaean baptism, which has nothing of the idea of escaping judgment, may preclude the possibility of the Mandaeans having originated in the Baptist's sect.⁴ The earliest valid information reports the sect existing in the neighbourhood of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in the eighth century. Since the preceding history is somewhat uncertain, the matter is not

1. R. Bultmann, Op.cit., Band II., Lief. 13, pp. 838-842.

2. H. Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World.

3. E. Peterson, "Urchristentum und Mandäismus," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1928, Band 27, Heft 1, p. 63.

4. F. Büchsel, "Mandäer und Johannesjünger," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1927, Band 26, Heft 2-4. pp. 219 ff.

closed and much of the teaching may have been current long before in a Hellenized Persian eschatology which entered into Jewish Christian circles.¹ The books of Enoch are already indicative of this process. But Odeberg has not depended upon the Mandaean literature alone but upon the Hermetica, the Jewish Hellenistic literature, and the Jewish mystical interpretations of the Old Testament as well.² Therefore, while John the author of the Fourth Gospel cannot be said to have borrowed directly from this literature, he seems to have appropriated the forms of its thought, much as Philo did. Yet the chief difference between John and Philo is this: the latter seeks to interpret the Scriptures by Greek thought, while John uses the Greek terminology and philosophy simply as a mould in which he expresses the Christian thought and experience. A radical revision, not only of the Jewish Christian eschatology but also of the Hellenized conception of life has occurred.³

Especially, in the conception of God, the possessor and giver of life, the Hellenistic, Jewish, and Christian streams seem to merge. In monotheistic Judaism of the post-exilic period, Elohim stood for the one God, transcendent and personal, who made the heaven and earth, revealed

1. R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, p. 351 f.

2. Cf. H. Odeberg, Op. cit., esp. Note 1, p. 120.

3. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Band II, Lief. 14, pp. 873, 874.

himself to the patriarchs, gave the law, and spoke by the prophets. The Theos of the Greeks originally signified a vague supernaturalism which later tended toward an uncertain monotheism. The term might signify Zeus, or Apollo, or Serapis in common usage; but then again it may not signify the singling out of any of these individual gods but simply the divine as such, especially as used by the Greek poets and philosophers. The reflection of this use of Theos for the divine as such is also to be traced in the Hermetic literature.¹ From this, we have some idea of the conception which the Greek term carried to the minds of the readers of the Septuagint in the Diaspora. A doubtful indication of this is shown in that the divine character of this life of God which comes to men also appears in Philo's writings.²

It is therefore in speaking of the 'Divine as such' that John can say, "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God and the Logos was God (divine)" (1:1).³ This divine Logos is furthermore divine life and

1. C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 5 ff. A most excellent work in tracing the influence of Greek concepts on the translation of Hebrew literature.

2. J. Grill, Untersuchung über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums, Band I, p. 208.

3. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. II, p. 352 f. This could scarcely have come to be applied to the Messiah from the old Rabbinic schools.

light which comes to earth and is apprehended by knowing; the term is also found in Hellenistic Gnostic literature.¹ In view of this, humanity is redeemed from its present state and brought into the eternal state of having the divine life.² It is thus that the distinction between the two spheres of existence takes the place of the Jewish distinction between the two ages.³ The rebirth in the higher world is further indicated in the Corpus Hermeticus according to which this rebirth is effected by the God of Life, Light, and Truth.⁴ In this process, the divine Theos takes the place of the Psyche of man so that the latter becomes the Psyche of God.⁵ In this fact of the real and immediate presence of the Divine, Hellenistic philosophy makes an unquestionable contribution to Johannine thought, for Jewish thinking would hardly have conceived of the Jew being in God in the same way that John does (17:21, 23).

There is, however, a Jewish cast to the author's interpretation of life which gives other than Hellenistic

1. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 874; also, R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 66; cf. Jno. 17:3.

2. G. Murray, Five Stages of Greek Religion, p. 197.

3. W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, p. 38.

4. S. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 99; Corpus Hermeticus XIV (XIII), Hymn of Poimandres.

5. R. Reitzenstein, Op. cit., p. 408; Corpus Hermeticus Tract XII.

meanings to the terms used. There are those who have gone to the extreme of denying all connection between John and contemporary Hellenistic influences, and explaining the Logos exclusively from the Old Testament Scriptures and kindred literature.¹ This view might easily be taken if the word 'Logos' is traced through the Gospel and associated with Jewish parallels. This is, however, to escape from the real issue, which is to determine whether this Incarnate Logos performs the function of a redeemer in a similar fashion as redemption is secured in Gnosticism. When this issue is not evaded, the parallels are too striking to be ignored.

On the other hand, there are certain radical differences which are introduced from the Jewish side. While the author uses the idea of an incarnate Logos in a fashion somewhat similar to the Gnostic and Mystery religions, the actual content of the meaning comprehends that of the Old Testament "Memra", or Divine Wisdom of the contemporary Hellenistic literature of the Diaspora.² The pre-existence of Wisdom is already established in Proverbs. "The Lord

1. C. J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 677 f. Citations from C. J. Wright are all from this work rather than his earlier volume, The Meaning and Message of the Fourth Gospel.

2. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 56.

possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was" (8:22,23; cf. Ecc. 1:4). Already, the creation had been attributed to the activity of the word of the Lord (Gen. 1:1, Ps. 33:6f.). Wisdom is called the Master Workman who does the will of God in creation (Prov. 8:27-30). God's word to the Jew was His revealing activity,¹ in history as well as in creation. The Psalmist says: "The nations raged, the kingdoms were moved; He uttered his voice, the earth melted. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge" (Ps. 46:6,7). This Word of God is also represented as a thing separated from Him which is sent upon the earth to do His will, and which will not return to Him until it has accomplished the purpose for which it is sent. Furthermore, the activity of this Word is life-giving - like the rain from heaven which "watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater ..." (Isa. 55: 10f.).

These words disclose a striking similarity to certain sayings of Jesus about his mission in the Fourth Gospel:

1. C. J. Wright, Op. cit., p. 677.

"My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work" (Jno. 4:34).

"I came that they may have life and have it abundantly" (John 10:10).

"I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do. And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:4-5).

Thus, Jesus is not only the new life imparted as a supersensuous substance;¹ he is a new kind of activity, God actively revealing Himself in history.² However, the most striking instance in which Christ appears as revealing God's will in the world is the Johannine substitution of Christ for the Torah. According to the Jew, obedience to the Torah meant life, disobedience meant death (Deut. 30:19-20). For this Law, John substitutes Christ who is truly he to whom the Law points. John is evidently setting Christ at the peak of the Torah in his polemic against the Jews when he says, "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me that ye may have life" (5:39). This indicates the contribution which Jewish thought makes to the Johannine picture of the Christ.

1. Cf. E. F. Scott, Op. cit., p. 258.

2. Cf. the contrast with Philo: J. Grill, Untersuchung über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums, p. 211.

However the two streams of Greek and Jewish thought merge in the Hellenistic literature of the Jews and particularly in the Wisdom of Solomon¹ in which illumination for the Fourth Gospel is to be found. C. J. Wright has recognized certain parallels from the Wisdom of Solomon but classifies it with the Jewish Palestinian writings without any distinction so that the Hellenistic trends apparently escape his notice.² According to it, wisdom is "a breath of the power of God, and a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty For she is an effulgence from everlasting light, and an unspotted mirror of the working of God ..." (7:25,26). Here we see the author changing alternately from Jewish to Greek forms of expression in bringing his message about wisdom to his contemporaries. From this Jewish "breath of the power of God", he turns to the "effluence of the glory of the Almighty;" likewise, from the Greek or Gnostic "effulgence from everlasting light", he turns to the Jewish phrase, "an unspotted mirror of the working of God."³ This may explain the uniting of the two streams of thought in John, in which the Logos is both the creator and light (1:3-5).

1. Cf. R. H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 303 ff.

2. C. J. Wright, Op. cit., pp. 677, 678.

3. Cf. James 1:23-25.

Wisdom is, as the Logos in John, the bestower of immortality (8:13,17), since she herself is radiant and unfading (6:12). The love of her is shown by obedience to her laws (6:18), the heeding of which confirms incorruption in the same way that the love of Christ must result in keeping his commandments and obedience procures life (John 14:23, 8:51). God bestows His grace when He bestows wisdom (8:21; cf. Jno. 3:16, 1:14). Perfection in all other things without wisdom is insufficient (9:6). Wisdom is the sole revealer of heavenly things (9:17; cf. Jno. 14:6), since the soul is weighed down by a corruptible body whose "earthly frame lieth heavy on a mind that is full of cares" (9:15), and so is prevented from beholding heavenly things. Only that wisdom which is from on high is able to reveal the things from on high (9:17; cf. Jno. 6:46, 14:9-11). These passages are sufficient to show how the merging of Jewish and Hellenistic thought in contemporaneous literature is markedly similar to the same process in John. The similarity must indicate that the Johannine Gospel must have arisen in the same Hellenistic stream of thought.

The eternal aspect of life is transformed in the Fourth Gospel to a matter of quality or sphere, rather than life in the future age.¹ This will be indicated in the

1. Cf. A. H. McNeil, Matthew, p. 263.

discussion of the Parousia. It is life which is imperishable (3:16), and hence survives the vicissitudes of physical disintegration. This quality of incorruptibility which is also a Pauline conception¹ and that of a heavenly essence which is Hellenistic in its origin, are the two qualities which characterize the eternal life. The term 'eternal' has less the connotation of duration than that of incorruptibility.² Space-time relationships no longer exist in the heavenly world, at least not in the sense that they do in the physical world.³ "The difference between existence in spiritual space and in earthly space is probably to be characterized by the universal unity and all inclusiveness (of the former). This will account for the seemingly contradictory views, e.g., of the relation between the descended Son of Man and his spiritual home, his abode with His Father, perhaps most strikingly illustrated by a comparison of 14:10 with 14:12, ... or by 3:13."⁴ For reasons yet to be indicated, there is the strange mixture of life and judgment already entered by the believer, and at the same time yet to be faced at the consummation.

1. I Cor. 15.

2. Cf. J. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, p. 232; G.H. McGregor, The Gospel of John, p. 80 f.

3. Eternal life, however, does not signify a mode of inert existence in a timeless, ideal world. As activity has a future, so eternal life has an eternal future. Jno. 4:14, 6:27; cf. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 872.

4. H. Odeberg, Op. cit., p. 114.

Odeberg would make three stages of progress in the transition from mortal to eternal life. In the first stage, which occurs in a man's earthly existence, "he may pass directly from earthly mortal existence into the highest spiritual life" If this first step is not taken he may pass through physical death, enter into Sheol, and some time after his death obtain eternal life. Or "the obtainment of eternal life may be related to a definite eschatological event"¹ This argument is derived from the discourse of Jesus concerning the resurrection in John 5:24-29. In this passage Jesus addresses first the living whom he calls to eternal life through his word, then the dead who are called to life; and finally he calls all in the tombs to judgment. However, these first two stages seem more likely to refer to the same event, the awakening from spiritual death to spiritual life.² What actually occurs is not the tracing of the process of the bestowal of eternal life in stages, so much as the tracing of the logical sequence of eternal life as a present realization to the Jewish Christian belief of a future consummation.

1. H. Odeberg, Op. cit., p. 209.

2. C. Wright, Op. cit., p. 760; also J. Bernard, Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 242.

Therefore, the eternal aspect of life in the Fourth Gospel retains the Jewish emphasis on activity. For the Jew, God is living and active. Any life that resembles the life of God or participates in His life must partake of that nature. However, the Greek emphasis on a higher essence which is incorruptible, a new sphere of existence and new kind of being, enters also into the Johannine thought of eternal life. The new life is different in essence as well as expression. These two elements constitute those qualities which are characteristic of the eternal aspect of life.

The conception of life in John thus retains certain elements that are both Jewish and Greek. It has a distinctly noetic quality so that the possession of it is a kind of knowledge (17:3). Also it is knowledge of the truth so that the words of Jesus may be termed the vehicles of life (6:63). Jesus is the 'true vine', the 'true bread' and the 'true light', all of which give the impression of the Platonic conception of ideas.¹ Life may also be described as a light which shines in the darkness and the darkness does not comprehend it; that is, the light is a

1. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 253 f.

knowledge which may illumine men's darkened minds and spirits. This matter of life as enlightenment is stressed in the miracle of Jesus' opening the eyes of the man born blind (9:13 ff.). While the term 'life' does not occur, the very fact that this is a healing miracle shows that Jesus in making a man whole is bringing him life. Blindness, sin and judgment are further related to each other, in this incident (9:39-41). As has already been indicated, 'to see' means to perceive the spiritual world and to have a share in it. Judgment implies decision which is ultimately the decision between life and death (3:19).

Although life has this noetic quality so that it can be identified with light and knowledge, a radical departure is introduced by John from the Greek speculative philosophy, in that apprehension of life does not come through the intellect alone, but is principally conditioned by the will. In other words, the Jewish emphasis on the moral quality of life is the condition of the enlightened life. One of the most significant statements in John is the word of the Christ, "If any man will do His will, he shall know the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (7:17; cf. I John 2:17). These words are a revolt against the arid speculation of the Greek philosophical and Gnostic schools on the one hand, and

against Jewish legalism on the other. Yet they open the personality at once to the unlimited discovery of God, while at the same time opening a productive course of moral activity.¹ Within them are contained both the admonition to freedom by knowing the truth (8:31,32) and the declaration that, "every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest in God" (3:20,21; cf. I Jno.2:4 f.). "Though in our Gospel, as for Plato, and Philo, the intellectual aspect of religion is always prominent (4:22, 8:32, 13:17, 14: 5, 17:7), yet for John, as for the Hebrew psalmists and prophets, to 'know the Lord' is also to trust him, and to serve him, to bend one's being to his will and purpose (17:25, 8:19)."²

The foundation of this life which is imparted as truth and moral activity is God. God is the original 'Life' and has those qualities, the participation in which insures divine life for the believer. "John, however, as a Jewish thinker, cannot escape from the idea of God as the living God. He assumes that in Him, as in man, there

1. Cf. H. Odeberg, Op. cit., p. 148. "'Doing the truth' is not equivalent with 'performing good deeds' but ... with actuating one's true being."

2. G. H. McGregor, Op. cit., p. 240.

is an animating principle which forms the ground of his manifold activities and is the ultimate and eternal life."¹
 In this sense, God is in Christ active in history; and participation in this activity, in this moral purpose by aligning one's self with the Divine Will, is participation in the Divine life. Union with God is therefore a life of active participation in God's purpose as revealed in the life of Christ (14:11, 12).²

Jesus makes it clear that this life is definitely active in the figures he uses. When he speaks of the water of life he is referring to living, fresh, flowing water of the πηγή, and not the still water of the φρέαρ (4:12 ff.). To Hebrew thought, water from the spring was often symbolic of "the living energy proceeding from God."³ It was life-giving, breaking forth in the wilderness and making it to blossom (Isa. 35:6). It seems not unlikely that the story of the woman of Samaria has allegorical significance, contrasting the water in the well, representing the Torah, with the water of Christ, which becomes

1. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 257.

2. In this sense, life as revelation in history may be contrasted with Gnostic doctrines with their mythical basis. Cf. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 874.

3. C. J. Wright, Op. cit., p. 745; cf. Jer. 2:13, 17:13.

a "fountain of water springing up unto eternal life" (4:14).¹ The overflowing nature of this life is also indicated in the words of Jesus in which he seeks to describe this life which he offers as abundance (10:10). It is therefore constantly brought forth as a life which is outgoing. The believer who possesses it cannot keep it to himself - it must ever be an outgoing stream bringing life to the desert waste of men's lives (8:38).² This life is God's activity among men communicating His life from man to man.

It is only this new life which is eternally satisfying, consequently, the symbols of water and bread are used to describe it. As water quenches the thirst and bread the hunger, so this life which Christ imparts satisfies the longings of the inner life of man. It is a perennial fountain which quenches his thirst (4:14); it is the imperishable bread which abides to eternal life (6:27). As Odeberg says concerning the contrasts in the story of the Samaritan woman (4:7 ff.): "By the antithesis of the spring of living water within and the well of water without, the identity of spiritual realities are again hinted

1. Ibid., p. 746; cf. I Enoch 48:1 and Ch. 49, where the fountain of the water of wisdom is associated with the Elect One.

2. Ibid., p. 790.

at. The teaching of Jesus is not a teaching merely con-
cerning the spiritual realities and the eternal life, but
 it is the eternal life and the spiritual reality Hence-
 forth the spiritual realities abide in the knower, and the
 knower in them."¹ But the distinction goes even deeper,
 in that the contrast in the kinds of water is between what
 is ultimately real, genuine, and therefore eternally satis-
 fying, and that which is false and thus only momentarily
 satisfying. All that is unreal, or not genuine, serves
 only to indicate the quest for the real and genuine. All
 quests for specific things to satisfy human longings are
 merged into the one longing for life. Whoever has this
 life of Christ has all (10:10).² When, for instance,
 John takes over the Gnostic Redeemer Myth for his Christo-
 logical scheme, he is thereby saying that he recognizes
 the Gnostic quest for life as a real quest; that he trans-
 forms it and brings it to its answer.² This quality of
 the life in Christ which makes him the one and only satis-
 faction for all human need is one of the great themes of
 John's gospel. It is the answer to the pagan's quest, the
 living spring for the Jew's dry legalism, the abundant
 fulfillment of every human longing. It is here that John

1. H. Odeberg, Op. cit., p. 168.

2. Cf. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Band II, Lief. 14, p.873-874.

touches the center of Christian experience and truly speaks from his own life.

Being a life of abundance, a life which has perennial satisfaction, it must also be a life of joy. There is the moment in the Gospel story when the joy of the disciples is about to be taken away. This is, significantly, the moment when Christ who is their life is about to be taken from them (16:20). The removal of the presence of Christ is the great sorrow, because his presence is life and light. This indicates to what extent that life and joy are bound up with Christ. Yet the peculiar nature of this joy lies in two facts. The joy of the disciples is the sorrow of the world, and the sorrow of the disciples is the joy of the world (16:20); and the joy of the disciples is fulfilled only through pain and sorrow. The way of life and joy for the disciples is the way of a cross for "the Son of man must be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life" (3:14,15). However, as the woman in travail has pain in bringing a child into the world but the sorrow is turned into joy over the male child that is born, so also the sorrow over the death of Christ will finally turn to joy for the disciples through his return to them as a vital presence. For, Christ's purpose and mission is that the joy which is in himself may also be

in them (15:11).

The conception of joy through pain is therefore linked to the idea of the cross in much the same way as is life through death. There is one way in which Jesus can be fruitful - that is through death. The illustration of the seed falling in the ground is used in a different manner than in the Pauline discourse on the resurrection life (I Cor. 15:36). In this instance (Jno. 12:24), the death of Christ is the "necessary prelude to the rise and extension of the Christian Church."¹ While the Church already existed in its beginnings in the lifetime of Christ, its real world mission and character was not possible until the glorified Christ "could be present with his people everywhere, and make them partakers in eternal life."¹

But this law of life through death applies also to the believer, yet in a different way. He must hate his Psyche in this world in order to keep it "unto eternal Zoe." This saying may have been repeated several times by Jesus in slightly different forms. Its literal meaning intimates a choice between apostasy and death, at least in the occurrences in the Synoptic Gospels.² If hating

1. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 228.

2. J. Bernard, St. John, Vol. II, p. 434.

means 'giving up' in the event of a crisis as the Lukan context seems to indicate (14:26), the same meaning may be derived here. Yet the contrast between the sphere of the world and that of eternal life which occurs in John leads to the conclusion that a more immediate meaning is intended for the saying. This world is under condemnation for the enemies of Jesus are of this world, while Jesus is not of this world and so is hated by them (Jno.9:39, 12:31, 8:23). Jesus' kingdom is not of this world because physical force is characteristic of an earthly kingdom (18:36). The Psyche in this world is therefore the Psyche in darkness (1:5), condemned to the use of physical violence for its ends, so that it must already be hated by him who is a member of the world of Christ. The tension between the believer and the world must always exist in order that his true life may be preserved. The words of C. J. Wright penetrate deeply into the meaning of this saying: "He who would live for the immediate present will lose eternal good. His values are of time, not of eternity; of sense, not of spirit; of self, not of the Father. Such a life disintegrates with the inevitability of 'dust to dust', ashes to ashes." It partakes of the transitoriness of the materialistic shows of a delusive world. Its end is death. But he who would renounce the vanities of immediate

profit and of selfish ends will gain eternal good."¹

But deeper still, the very self which is satisfied by the world's carnal transitory show must first be hated in order that a new self merged in God may be born.²

Joy as a quality of this new life of the disciple is intimately linked by John to love.³ The joy of Jesus is his intimate communion with the Father through obedience and love for his disciples. (15:10 ff.). His joy is a life sacrificed to God and his disciples, even to the point of the cross. That is also his great love (15:13), for there is no great love without the denial of self (I Jno. 3:16). Hence for Jesus' disciples to share his joy, they must also share his love by their love for one another, and obedience to him which brings unity.⁴ This obedience is not only to Jesus but also to God, "for all things that I (Jesus) heard from my Father I have made known unto you" (15:15), so that the real unity of the disciples is in the will of God. Unity in the will of God is unity in Christ, the perfect expression of that Will. Consequently, this higher sphere of unity is opposed by the world because the world has hated Jesus, the perfect expression of the will of God (15:17 ff).

1. C. J. Wright, Op. cit., p. 861.

2. Cf. H. J. Holtzmann and W. Bauer, Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes, p. 224.

3. This is in fundamental agreement with the Synoptic Gospels. Mt.9:14-16; Lk.22:14-18, 29-30.

4. R. Bultmann, Op.cit., Band II., Lief. 14, p. 873. The ἀγάπη stands in believer's subjection to the divine ἐντολή.

It is therefore a cause for joy to spiritual leaders when the members of a church walk according to the commands of God, because this unity is being preserved (1:4). John the Baptist's joy lies in the exaltation of Christ, not in his own advancement (3:29). Humility and service in obedience are the expression of the disciple's love and joy (14:15; 15:10,11).

The peace which is offered with this new life is the peace of Christ won through love and obedience. Christ shares his peace with the disciples, because he imparts the final reconciliation to God which is the ultimate peace. He indicates this when he says: "If a man love me he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (14:23). This is the basis for the later statement, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you" (14:27; cf. 16:33). This peace is not a withdrawal from the world, but, on the contrary, is based on Christ's victory over the world which also may become that of the disciples (16:33).¹ Just as God sent Jesus into the world to bring the message of peace and victory over the world, so Jesus sends the disciples (20:21). The victory of Jesus over the world is however an inner victory, because as outwardly viewed it appeared to be a defeat. It was the victory of an inwardly harmonious and adjusted life in the midst of afflictions.²

1. Cf. Wm. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, p. 198.

2. A. Titius, Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit, Teil III, p. 21.

THE RELATION BETWEEN SYNOPTIC AND JOHANNINE "LIFE."

Life in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus had been closely related to the expected coming of the Kingdom of God; and similarly for Paul, as also for the Primitive Church, this expectation was always present in his conception of the true life of the believer. In the Apostolic age and following, this expectation had been the inspiring force of the Church's life. Years passed, however, without the expected return of the Messiah. The first enthusiasm was replaced by doubt and depression. The first generation of disciples to whom the coming of the Kingdom had been promised had passed away.¹ Except to the fanatical few, that which had strengthened much of the activity of the Church was beginning to appear as an illusion. There was doubtless strength in the Jewish apologetic against the Church due to the failure of the promised coming of the Messiah. For this reason, the need for a new interpretation of the Return of Christ was needed.

The Return of Christ becomes the central theme in this effort of the writer of the Fourth Gospel to reconcile the apparent inconsistency between the expectation of the Messiah's return and his failure to appear, - in fact almost

1. Mark 9: 1.

as central as in the Synoptic Gospels and in Paul, although subject to a different interpretation. The whole Johanneine reinterpretation of life in the Synoptics may be accounted for as in part due to the author's desire to reinterpret the Parousia. His message to the Church is that the real Parousia had already occurred. He identifies the Parousia with the presence of Christ with the believer which first became possible when Christ through his death reassumed his glory. No longer limited by his earthly bodily existence, Jesus is enabled to reveal himself to the individual believer as a real but unseen presence.¹

The Supper discourses of the Fourth Gospel correspond to the Apocalyptic discourses preceding the passion in the Synoptic Gospels. The original apocalyptic motif is retained in John, true to the tradition. Jesus presents the expectation of the heavenly mansions (tabernacles) as a hope to be realized entirely in the future. Then Thomas asks the way to the mansions. The answer of Jesus is significant, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ) (Jno. 14: 6: cf. 10: 10). Jesus is not only the way to the future Kingdom; he is himself the heavenly reality, the divine life revealed to the disciples. Here we see the

1. E.F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 300-303. Cf. W. Manson, Christ's View of the Kingdom of God, pp. 90, 91, who traces this tendency to Jesus' own teaching.

synoptic eschatology telescoped into the present. In the synoptic thought, Jesus shows the way to life.¹ In Johanne thought he is the life. The life-bestowing Kingdom of the future is replaced by the life-bestowing person in the present. Although Pauline thought had conceived of Christ as life-giving, and this had replaced the centrality of the Kingdom as life-giving (I Cor. 15: 45 ff.), nevertheless the actual bestowal of final eternal life by the heavenly man remains for the Parousia. Christ in the believer is always the beginning of the better yet to be; the Spirit was but the first-fruits of this expectation (Rom. 8: 23). In John's gospel the emphasis is upon the fact that Christ already imparts the new life and abundance (10: 10).

Furthermore, the death by separation of man from God is bridged by Jesus.² "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (14: 9). The blessing of communion with God in the eschaton has come, not by the believers going to Him but by God sending His son as the revelation of and communion with Himself.³ While Jesus speaks to the disciples

1. Matt. 7: 14.

2. Cf. H.J. Holtzmann and W. Bauer, Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes, p. 35.

3. O. Schaefer has significantly pointed out the relations between John 14: 6 and vs. 9, and related them to Jesus' thanksgiving prayer of revelation in the Synoptics (Matt. 11: 25-27 - Lk. 10: 21-22), Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, usw., Band 30, Heft 2/3, p. 215, 1933.

he is still in the flesh, but when he puts off the limits of the bodily existence by his death, then he and the Father will come to abide with the believers (14: 19, 20). For this reason he can say, "Because I live, ye shall live also," thereby relating his present possession of the heavenly life with the future bestowal of it after the resurrection.¹

Again, Christ as mediator of life is expressed in the allegory of the vine and the branches: "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered ..."² Death is, therefore, not the condemnation set by God upon the sinner but the deprivation of life through separation from Christ.

From these instances where the Parousia is related to the Johannine conception of life, its relation to Paul's conception of life may also be discerned. While it is doubtful that ^{the} thought of a "glorified Christ of experience" apart from the "human Jesus of history,"³ is to be found with Paul, yet his emphasis on the former powerfully influenced the Church toward a like emphasis on the glorified Christ, almost to the separation of his exalted state from his earthly life. In view of Christ's death, the earthly

1. J. Bernard, St. John (ICC), Vol. II, p. 548.

2. Jno 15: 6.

3. G. McGregor, The Gospel of John, p. xxviii.

life, as it was lived to that end (Phil. 2: 8),¹ seems chiefly to have had significance for Paul. Paul's fundamental experience in which he was conscious of Christ as the "Man from heaven" who was God's servant, obedient to death, and declared to be the Son of God with power, seems to lie behind the Fourth Gospel's presentation of the glorified Christ;² yet the whole Pauline doctrine of justification unto life is omitted by John, for a doctrine of life by participation in Christ through belief in him as the Son of God.³

Again, in the use of the Spirit as almost equivalent to Christ, the Johannine representation approaches that of Paul. This Spirit is offered after the resurrection (14: 16; 7: 39) as the Paraclete, Helper or Advocate. E.F. Scott declares that "the more closely we examine the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, the more we are compelled to acknowledge that there is no real place for it in the Johannine theology as a whole."⁴ If the explanation is true that "the Spirit was to take the place of Christ, and therefore could not be while He was yet present,"⁵ then it may

1. E.F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 52, 53.

2. E. Scott, Ibid., p. 50; cf. W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, pp. 59-60.

3. Jno. 20: 31. Cf. W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, pp. 28, 29.

4. Op. cit., p. 347.

5. Ibid., p. 332.

be acknowledged that there is no real place for the Spirit in Johannine theology. But the Johannine emphasis on the Spirit has a real place in his theology when its significance in replacing Jesus is understood. When Jesus was physically present, the disciples could be aware of and in communion with him through their sense organs. But with Jesus' departure, his glorified existence could not be present to the physical senses. A new organ of revelation was required to make the disciples conscious of his glorified presence and of the heavenly reality (ἁλὸς) which he embodied. The Spirit is the new presence which is bestowed as a helper and revealer, with the believers collectively as well as in them individually (14: 17).¹ Since this Spirit is of this supernatural order, the world cannot behold it. This word "behold" (ὁρᾶτε), as we shall continue to observe, is often used by John with reference to physical sight in contrast to spiritual discernment.²

Yet the special function of the Spirit is not to reveal itself, but to bear witness to Christ and bring the disciples into all^{the} reality of the heavenly world.³ Those things which Christ failed to reveal to the disciples while

1. J. Bernard, Op. cit., p. 546.

2. Cf. E.A. Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary, p. 104; also J. Bernard, Op. cit., p. 546.

3. Jno. 14: 26; 15: 26-27; 16: 13 ff.

present with them will be revealed by the Spirit (16: 15). The Spirit brings a reversal of verdict upon the world with respect to Christ who was sentenced as guilty when in truth the world was guilty (16: 8 ff.). It is therefore a witness for the Church against the World. Manson has set forth understandingly the true relation of the Spirit and Christ when he says: "The Spirit does not go beyond Christ. The whole content of Divine revelation is already given in Christ. The Spirit merely takes the things of Christ and opens up their meaning."¹ Yet this reveals that even to those who knew him best in the flesh he was but partially known. The Spirit would continue to guide more fully.

The Spirit is accordingly the organ of life in so far as it is the organ of revelation. Its function in revealing the glorified Christ who reveals God is a life-bestowing function. For John, eternal life emerges in knowing God, and His messenger.² Jesus has hitherto brought this life through his own physical presence to those who have discerned God's revelation in him.³ But after his death and glorification, the communication of his life is made possible by

1. W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, p. 208; cf. also pp. 206 ff.

2. Jno. 17: 3.

3. Ibid., 14: 6.

the Spirit. In this way, the Spirit may be said to replace Jesus' own physical presence in presenting the life-bestowing revelation of the heavenly reality in Christ.¹

There is another more comprehensive sense in which John uses the word 'spirit,' by which it is not confined to the post-resurrection revelation of Christ. This wider sense must be kept distinct from the special bestowal of the Spirit by the risen Christ upon his disciples.² Such instances as that in which true worshippers are called upon to worship the Father in "spirit and in truth" (4: 24), or "The words that I speak unto you are spirit" (6: 63), can scarcely be regarded as wholly equivalent to those where reference to this special gift of the Spirit occurs. In this instance reference is made to the higher realm, the heavenly realm or sphere which is distinguished from the earthly. God is a Spirit (4: 24), and entrance into the realm of God therefore requires a spiritual birth (3: 5). "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing" (6: 63). Yet even in these instances, the telescoping of the eschatological into the present may be observed. The later activity of the Spirit in the Church

1. Cf. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 332.

2. Jno. 20: 22, 23.

is recorded as occurring in the life-time of Jesus, in order to identify the post-resurrection period with the historical Jesus, and to establish a real continuity between the two. "John therefore, instead of disregarding the earthly life, takes it as the basis of his exposition of the larger activity of Christ."¹

Again, in the three instances where reference to the Kingdom of God occurs, a similar telescoping of the eschaton into the present is observable. This is not to say, however, that Jesus did not himself on occasion likewise speak of the Kingdom as a present possession, or at least as having its beginnings already while he was on earth.² The discourse with Nicodemus is chosen for the opening of the discussion of the Kingdom of God. It is noticeable that the traditional eschatological forms are retained. Nicodemus is told of the conditions of entering "into the Kingdom of God" (3: 5; cf. Matt. 7: 21). "In the corresponding Synoptic passage (Mk. 10: 17) the favorite Johannine word 'life' occurs, though doubtless without the full mystical content which it always bears in our Gospel."³ In fact, it definitely refers to life in the coming age. But in the first

1. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 299.

2. Lk. 17: 20.

3. G. McGregor, Op. cit., p. 69.

statement of Jesus to Nicodemus, he speaks not of entering into the Kingdom of God but of the new birth as the condition of seeing the Kingdom of God. It is this word 'see' which carries the key to the Johannine interpretation of the relation of the believer to the Kingdom.

Certain parallel instances of the use of the word 'see' have been compared to this, such as in Luke 2: 26, Acts 2: 27, I Peter 3: 10, which convey the notion 'to have an experience of.'¹ An examination of the passages fails to indicate a real analogy to the Johannine parallel. The type of 'seeing' indicated in the parallel instances has reference to experiencing the events of the earthly life, while that of John to discerning through a supernatural experience the heavenly realities. The true parallel which contributes to the understanding of this passage is the saying of Jesus, "Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mk. 9: 1). It is not unreasonable to suppose that this prophecy which was unfulfilled in the early Church should preoccupy the mind of John, in his desire to reconcile Jesus' saying with subsequent history. In both the

1. Cf. G. McGregor, Op. cit., p. 69; also, J. Bernard, Op. cit., p. 102 f., in which comparison is also made with extracanonical literature.

Johannine and the Markan passages, forms of the verb ἰδεῖν are used.

John, therefore, proceeds to transfer the emphasis from the appearance of the Kingdom which was generally expected in the future, to the seeing of the Kingdom which (according to the interpretation of John) is present to him who has undergone the supernatural process which enables him to discern it. A birth from above (ἄνωθεν)¹ is essential to the perception of the Kingdom which is above. The Kingdom is thus a spiritual sphere to which one belongs by undergoing the new birth by which he is enabled to see the heavenly realities. In the second reference to it (vs. 5), the birth is further defined as by the water and the spirit. The birth by the Spirit is due to the Spirit's action as the organ of revelation, and is thereby a necessary preliminary to the 'seeing' of the Kingdom of God. Why, then, is the water required along with the Spirit for membership in the Kingdom? In this second instance (vs. 5), John refers to 'entrance into the Kingdom of God' in place of 'seeing the Kingdom of God,' by which he means that entrance into the Kingdom of God is the entrance into the Church. Entrance into the Church is outwardly effected

1. Cf. J. Bernard, Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 102.

by baptism, its outward symbol, although the action of the Spirit is required, since the true Church is of this spiritual realm. Water baptism is thus a sign that the believer is in the open for Christ.¹ Hence, both baptism by the Spirit and by the water is required for entrance into this true Church.

John secures the testimony of the Church to show that the new birth is not a speculative theory but an experienced reality. He affirms this in the words, "We speak that we know, and bear witness of that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness" (3: 11).² However, in the following section it becomes apparent that in the change from "we" to "I" (vs. 12) the Church has been identified with Christ.³ Christ is identified with the Kingdom, in so far as the Kingdom represents the heavenly sphere, and Christ is the bearer of its heavenly realities. Thus John ultimately identifies the Kingdom with the glorified Christ who has entered into his glory by his crucifixion (3: 14), and in whom the believer has eternal life⁴(3: 15).

1. Cf. W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, p. 91.

2. Cf. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 104.

3. Cf. P. Gardner, The Ephesian Gospel, p. 115 f. who rightly senses this throughout the Gospel.

4. Cf. J. Bernard, Vol. I, Op. cit., p. 116. While Bernard follows the reading ἐν αὐτῷ (Ν Γ Δ Θ), he admits a preference among editors for ἐν αὐτῷ (BT^W).

By inference or by direct allusion, a series of identifications must be made to rescue this third chapter of John from confusion. The series begins with the Kingdom, which appears to be identified with the true Church by allusion to baptism, then with Christ as the heavenly reality who has come to earth, and finally with 'eternal life' which is this heavenly reality communicated to the believer. Odeberg rightly indicates this distinctive feature of the Johannine writings when he says, "Whereas the terrestrial world appears as a world of differentiation, of separation, of things existing by the side of each other, the spiritual world on the other hand is a world of all-inclusiveness of realities existing in each other, penetrating each other, mutually identical. The essential mark of membership of the spiritual, Divine world, is, from this point of view, to be expressed by the word 'unity.'¹ The use of the term "Kingdom" is quite unexpected in view of the appearance of the term "eternal life" in the parallel incident of the rich young ruler in the Synoptic Gospels. This goes further to show that both terms refer to the same sphere of supernatural reality in the Johannine appropriation of Synoptic materials.²

1. H. Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel, p. 113.

2. Mk. 10: 17 ff; cf. John 3: 5. Cf. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 37.

In the other instance where the term 'Kingdom' is used, it has reference to the realm in which Jesus' word is authoritative (18: 36 f). The authority of truth in the realm of Jesus is contrasted with force used by Pilate. Yet its contrast with the Synoptic view lies in this, that Christ's realm exists beside that of Pilate. In the same way as in the Nicodemus story, "the distinction between the material and spiritual world has superseded the Synoptic distinction between the present age and the age to come."¹

Another aspect of life in the coming age which is telescoped into the present is the resurrection of believers. John differs from Paul and the Synoptics in holding that life is the presupposition of the resurrection of Jesus rather than the result of it.² For those who are in the tombs, the hour is coming when they will hear the voice of the Son of God and live (5: 28). This statement is in conformity with the older tradition. But near it is the statement that, "The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live" (5: 25). Death and life have less of a physical connotation than a spiritual one in John's Gospel.

1. W. Manson, The Incarnate Glory, p. 220.

2. H.J. Holtzmann, Evangelium Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes, p. 35.

The spiritual and the physical resurrection occur together repeatedly in the Gospel, and in most instances the one stands beside the other.¹

However, it is in the story of Lazarus that Jesus sets his present bestowal of life on a footing with the final resurrection. Resurrection had meant for Paul but one thing, and when he treats of it in I Corinthians 15 and II Corinthians 5, he thinks only of the change of the body which must occur at the Parousia. The raising of the believer with Christ does not yet transform the believer into the final stage^{te} of eternal life. He always looks for its completion at the Parousia. The resurrection life imparted by Jesus is declared by him to be of the same order as that which is to be imparted in the final day. "Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die" (11: 24-26). "The Resurrection of the Dead is no longer bound up purely or primarily with a historical event at the end of time, but connects immediately with the Person of Jesus Christ and with the life which He bestows here and now."²

1. 5: 25, 28; 6: 40; 11: 23-25.

2. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 172.

The instance of the raising of Lazarus shows how realistically John conceives of this eschatological life as already bestowed by Jesus. The eternal life which Jesus bestows upon the believer now through belief is actually the resurrection life. As E.F. Scott has said:

"Those who believe in Him (Jesus) have risen already; their death is only in seeming, and they carry with them, into the world beyond the same life on which they entered here. Lazarus therefore had never died. Through faith in Christ he had possessed himself of the true life, and still continued in it, in spite of his apparent death. But this fact of his continuance in life is made manifest by his return at the call of Jesus to a bodily existence. The real miracle had been effected in him during his lifetime, in the act of his believing in Jesus; but his resurrection in the flesh gives a visible evidence and confirmation to the miracle.

"The true resurrection takes place in this present world, when a man believes in Christ and makes the transition 'from death unto life.'"¹

A somewhat different view seems to be taken by Manson who implies that the reference to the corruption of Lazarus' body, which had already set in, would necessitate a transformation of his body when Jesus called him forth (11: 39).² Reference to the text shows, however, that the decomposition of Lazarus' body is merely an inference of Martha's due to the fact that the body had been in the tomb four days. This is made explicit in the words which Martha gives as the sole

1. E.F. Scott, Op. cit., p. 250-251.

2. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 171.

reason for believing that the body was decomposed: "for (~~γὰρ~~) he has been dead four days." But Jesus himself regards this statement of Martha as implying unbelief in his previous declaration to her that Jesus himself is "the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live ..." (vs. 25). Therefore he says to her, "Said I not unto thee, that, if thou believest, thou shouldst see the glory of God?" (vs. 40). In fact, Jesus had already implied to his disciples that the state to which Lazarus had come was not death at all but sleep (vs. 11). The whole incident seems to have been meant to teach that, to the believer who already possessed the new life, this life is identical with the resurrection life of the eschaton.

The resurrection of Jesus is likewise identified with his earthly life in which he himself was the embodiment of eternal life. Thomas is told to "reach hither" his finger and place them in his Lord's nail prints, also to put his hand in his side (20: 27). He who had said, "I am the resurrection and the life" is the same as he who presented himself to the disciples in his risen form. This is the emphasis of John.¹ "Those who had entered most deeply into

1. Cf. I Jno. 1: 1.

the meaning of His earthly life would know Him best as He now was in His glory."¹ But Jesus says to Thomas, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed"(20: 29). In other words, blessed is he who identifies the historical Jesus with the risen Lord without necessitating Jesus' physical presence. John is thinking of those future believers whose experience of Christ through belief was as real a witness of his resurrection as that of Thomas.² Again, here, John is setting belief above physical sight as the organ of apprehending the true life.

Turning to the Johannine thought of the judgment, the telescoping of eschatology into the present approaches quite near to the Synoptic view.³ Already in this latter, to hear and heed is to have life.⁴ To hear and refuse the call of Jesus is to be judged already (Matt. 7: 24 ff.). Likewise in John, the judgment is already indicated according as the words of Jesus are received: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life" (5: 24). It

1. E.F. Scott, Op. cit., p. 310; cf. H. Holtzmann, and W. Bauer, Op. cit., p. 35.

2. Cf. E.F. Scott, Op. cit., p. 312.

3. Cf. H. Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, Vol. II, pp. 305-306.

4. Luke 9: 60.

is a judgment which is based upon the deeds indicative of the quality of the life, "And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil" (Jno. 3: 19).

The most striking parallel to John, regarding judgment occurs in the Synoptic gospels in Mark 4: 11, 12. The "mystery" of the Kingdom of God is revealed only to the disciples, but to those without "all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them." In the Johannine version, Jesus says, "For judgment came I into this world, that they that see not may see; and they that see may become blind" (9: 39). The significant change in this passage is that the words of Jesus as the organ of judgment are supplanted by the person of Jesus. The Synoptic account implies that Jesus is authoritative in his word because he represents God and speaks for Him. In the Johannine account, Jesus himself as Son of God is the Word. Life and judgment are the result of an attitude toward his person rather than toward his words alone. This identification of Jesus himself with his words will be of special significance in the Johannine passage on the Bread of Life (6: 35 ff.).

The significance of judgment and of Jesus as judge is brought into full relief in John's Gospel. While the judgment is not only a future event but one which has already presented itself to the believer (5: 24), John's position is very near to that of Paul in that he conceives of a final judgment on the basis of good and evil deeds for the world at large (5: 28, 29; cf. Rom. 2: 6). But the distinctive emphasis in John's conception of the judgment of Christ is a positive one. Judgment is not so much a sentence pronounced by Jesus at the end of the age (II Cor. 5: 10) as the negative attitude of men toward the positive purpose of Jesus now to bestow life upon them. Indeed there are a number of passages which indicate that Jesus did not come to judge men at all (3: 17, 5: 45, 12: 47). He came to save rather than to be a divider and critic such as the Pharisees. "Jesus judged no man in that way; nor was He here in order to condemn. Judgment and condemnation are intrinsic to eternal life itself as the Father has revealed and quickened it in Jesus Himself The sifting which His presence achieves among men is just, because it has its origin in the Father whom He knows."¹ Jesus thus becomes an involuntary judge in so far as men are forced to

1. Major, Manson, Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 800.

decision by him, the revelation of God's Word and Will. Jesus' conformity to the will of God is his victory over the world in submitting to the cross which judges the world's evil (12: 31). His conformity to the Word and Will of God is furthermore a judgment upon those who refuse to accept him as God's revelation, from which there is no appeal (5: 22, 27, 8: 15, 16; 9: 39, 12: 31).

The positive aspect of Jesus' purpose in the world, which makes his condemnation of men their own responsibility, is expressed in the words, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, but men loved the darkness rather than the light" (3: 19).¹ Jesus remains throughout the Gospel the great life-giver and light. He expresses the outgoing love of the God who wills to bestow eternal life upon men, and desires that none should perish (3: 16). The judgment in John pictures God, not as the wrathful tyrant pronouncing sentence upon his rebellious subjects,² but as a sad-hearted Father who vainly seeks to restore his rebellious children.

There are those passages however in the Gospel and Epistles of John which are distinctly eschatological and cannot be explained as the telescoping of eschatology into

1. Cf. E. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 213 ff.

2. Rom. 1: 18, 32; 2: 5 f.

into the life of Jesus or into the experience of the Church. There is one class of passages which end invariably with the words, "and I will raise him up at the last day."¹ In these instances, the ending could often be omitted without changing the thought, and in several cases the clause serves only to confuse what precedes and follows. This would indicate the possibility that these passages are due to a redactor,² especially since the same words are repeated.³ However, the solution of E.F. Scott that the primitive tradition was introduced as a concession to the traditional belief of the Church may suffice.⁴ This solution eliminates the necessity of doing violence to the text and may explain the intrusion of certain passages for this purpose. Such a solution of the difficulty seems most obvious in the instance in which Jesus says, "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live" (5: 25).

From this brief review of the eschatological aspect of the Johannine life, the process of telescoping the life of the coming age into the present experience of the believer

1. Jno. 6: 54, 39, 40, 44.

2. R. Bultmann, Theol. Wörterbuch z. N. T., Band II, Lief. 14, pp. 872-873.

3. The occurrences in the epistles could be omitted not only without materially altering the thought, but also in some instances improving it (I Jno. 2: 28; 3: 2, 3; 4: 17). The possibility of a redactor's having introduced revisions is increased by the fact of the double ending of John.

4. Cf. Op. cit., p. 302 f., esp. p. 249.

is readily apparent. The discourses of Jesus are repeatedly used to address and reassure believers of the Church which is to come into existence after his death.¹ Hence, there is no well defined line between the Jesus of history and the glorified Christ of experience.

Several features of the Johannine conception of eternal life come to the fore in this analysis:

1. Christ is the revelation and mediator of eternal life from God to men.

2. Christ in the Parousia is Christ in the believer. Christ was crucified in order that he might be present with the believer, unlimited by a bodily existence. Yet this is the same Christ as he who walked among men.

3. The Spirit is the organ of the revelation of this glorified Christ to the believer, and thereby of eternal life. It is furthermore the believer's guide into all truth (16: 13).

4. The Kingdom of God is that supernatural sphere which includes the true Church, thereby Christ, and therewith eternal life, all of which are mutually inclusive. The emphasis is no longer upon the Kingdom's appearing but upon its being seen by the believer, since it is a present but supernatural sphere already manifest in Jesus Christ.

1. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 34 f.

5. The resurrection life, traditionally identified with the eschaton, is the present possession of the believer through Christ. Likewise, the eternal life possessed and bestowed by Christ in his earthly ministry is the same as that in his glorified state.

As has been indicated, the key to the relation between the synoptic teaching of Jesus about eternal life and the Johannine teaching is the telescoping of the synoptic life of the eschaton into the present experience of the believer. Similarly, the key to the connection between the Pauline teaching and the Johannine is the telescoping of the resurrection life into that of the historic Jesus, as well as the present life of the believer. This is not to say that the beginnings of this process are not already present in the synoptic and Pauline teaching, but the author of the Fourth Gospel makes it a conscious process.

What is the means which the author uses for making the life of the eschaton a present reality? "Whoever he was, the Evangelist was almost certainly a Jew, and in all probability, at least by birth and early training, a Jew of Palestine."¹ But he was a Jew with a great experience, a life which he wanted to share (20: 31). "It is tempting

1. G. McGregor, Op. cit., p. lxiv; cf. Major, Manson, Wright, Op. cit., p. 659.

to think that woven into the allegorical story of Lazarus in chapter 12 there is a personal experience of the author himself, raised to new life by the Master."¹ This life of the eschaton was a present reality to him. Yet the question was how to make his contemporaries see this life of the eschaton as already present. He found the means ready at hand in the Greek concepts already current in Jewish circles² in his day, and employed by the mystery religions and Gnosticism. He also employs these to show how this life is communicated to the believer.

THE COMMUNICATION OF LIFE.

The communication of eternal life is the purpose which the author of the Fourth Gospel gives for recording the life and miracles of Jesus (20: 31), so that even in those parts

1. C. Wright, Op. cit., p. 661.

2. So illustrated in the writings of Philo; Cf. E. Scott, Op. cit., pp. 58 ff. The parallels indicated are too striking to be regarded as accidental. Modern scholarship which looks to Jewish sources only has to rely on its ingenuity to combine the 'Memra' and 'Sophia,' and then translate these into the 'Logos' conception without the aid of Greek thought. Furthermore, the peculiar usage of the terms 'truth' and 'light' can hardly be explained apart from Greek usage. Contr. C. Wright, Op. cit., p. 676. Cf. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 38.

where eternal life is not specifically mentioned its communication is being furthered.¹ The statement of the purpose of the book implies that this recorded witness of the revelation of Jesus as the Son of God is itself a vehicle of eternal life. Life is not only the subject of the divine revelation; "the revelation proclaims that which it includes."² Lietzmann has held that the Gospel itself is less of a biography of Jesus than an evangelistic message, and there is much to verify this.³ This record is the Word, the witness which begets life to him who receives it. Jesus is therefore the bringer of life not only through his own proclamation, but also as the object of the proclamation of this revelation which brings life to him who believes (John 3: 14, 15).

Within the scheme of revelation the communication of life to the believer has its basis in the love of God, a love which is immeasurably displayed in the gift of His son who imparts eternal life to believers. "The Divine Gift is a gift emanating from the Father out of his love for the world. Love is the essence of that gift itself.

1. G. McGregor, Op. cit., p. xx.

2. B. Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 6.

3. H. Lietzmann, Lectures on the Gospel of John, Berlin University, Winter semester, 1932-33.

Thirdly, love is the constitutive quality of the Eternal Life conferred by the Divine Gift."¹ Not only is God desirous of saving the world from its earthiness but also from its darkness and sin (I Jno. 2: 1 ff.; Jno. 1: 5, 7: 7).² The matter is one of reconciliation in the Jewish sense, as well as imparting the heavenly life to those in the present world in the Hellenistic sense. The Son not only represents salvation but also light, so that God's act of love is not only an act of deliverance from earthiness but an act which delivers from sin and darkness and brings light and reconciliation.³ The sole reason for Jesus' coming is to express this love of God to the world. This is the bridging of the old difference between man and God, and establishing a new basis of communion in the new life which is bestowed through Christ. The great fact which is established in John as a starting point is that eternal life is bestowed and communicated from the Godward side. It is the expression of divine, undeserved love from God.⁴

1. H. Odeberg, Op. cit., p. 114.

2. Contr. H. Odeberg, Ibid., pp. 145 ff.

3. Cf. J. Grill, Op. cit., p. 7.

4. A. Titius, Op. cit., Vol. III, p. 28. Cf. F. von Hügel, Eternal Life, pp. 76 ff.

From the Godward side, therefore, there is a process of drawing men to the Christ in the communication of life. It is a process which God Himself effects by the agency of His Spirit. There is an element involved which cannot be accounted for from the human side.¹ For the communication to depend on man alone would involve the possibility of man's losing this new life in relation to God. Speaking of believers who are so possessed, Manson says, "They cannot fall from God for they are gripped. In their persuasion of faith the Eternal has laid hold of them, and they have laid hold of the Eternal."²

But since it is life which is involved, as well as reconciliation, this act from above is described as a new birth. We are born into the heavenly realm just as in the earthly. While baptism is the symbol, and is perhaps regarded by John as essential to the new birth, it is nevertheless merely the "vehicle and instrument of the Spirit."³ The new birth is from God and is fully realized only as an act of God by which men become His sons.⁴

As sons of God, believers are possessed of a higher will and are subject to new motives, thoughts, and desires

1. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 278. Cf. J. Carpenter, The Johannine Writings, p. 426.

2. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 159.

3. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 280.

4. G. McGregor, Op. cit., p. 70.

from above. But the change which is implied is even greater - it is a change in nature as well.¹ Scott is probably extreme in his view that the Spirit is ethically neutral in the process of the rebirth,² because the very fact that motives and desires come from above after the new birth implies that the ethical is essential to the change in nature. The First Epistle makes this very plain: "Who-soever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because His seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God."³ The lower nature is identified with the sinful nature, the higher is identified with the pure nature of God.

The communication of life from the Godward side had involved the bestowal of life through the gift of His Son. Christ was communicated to the believer in his person in two ways, through his words, and through the symbols of the sacraments. Much has been made of the parallel between the sacraments in John and those in the Mystery religions, the Hermetica, and other Hellenistic literature.⁴

1. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 281 f. Cf. J. Bernard, Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 106.

2. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 282.

3. I Jno. 3: 9.

4. Cf. S. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, pp. 99, 132; cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of St. Paul, p. 348.

There is much in the early Fathers to indicate a trend toward regarding the bread as in itself efficacious for conveying immortality. In the Eucharistic prayer of the "Teaching of the Twelve" (Didache), the unity of the Church is made the object of a plea through reference to the breaking of bread and feeding of the multitude by Jesus. As God has created food and drink for men's enjoyment, so He has bestowed spiritual food and drink and enjoyment and eternal life through His servant Jesus. Ignatius of Antioch regards the bread as the flesh of Jesus Christ himself and furthermore the medicine of immortality.¹ Justin Martyr interprets the eucharist in much the same way and argues that the mysteries of Mythra imitate this practise by complying to the demands of demons.² On the other hand, as indicated previously, John's view may have a possible relation to Paul's in designating the broken bread as the sacrifice of Christ for the life of the world.³

Although these two elements are present in the Eucharist, it is not to be explained as a magical method of obtaining immortality, nor is it associated with the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ as such.⁴ Indeed the institution

1. J. Carpenter, The Johannine Writings, pp. 433-434. Ignatius, Philad. IV; Ephes. 20: 2; Smyrna 7: 1. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of St. Paul, pp. 344 ff.

2. Justin, Apol. 1: 66.

3. J. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, p. 225.

4. Cf. Jno. 6: 51 which, however, refers to death as the means of Jesus' entering the glorified existence of the Parousia when his spirit will be imparted to the world at large.

of the Sacrament is completely omitted from the Johannine account of the Last Supper.¹ In its place is the discourse on the bread of life following the feeding of the multitude (John Ch. 6.). However, John shows that he is trying to avoid a quasi-magical conception of the Eucharist by the warning with which the discourse closes: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing" (6: 63).²

The difficulty with the quasi-magical explanations is that they try to dissociate the sacraments from the other phases of the Johannine teaching. The sacraments are first understood only when they are represented as the expression of the "Sacramental Principle" which pervades the entire Gospel. C.J. Wright has perceived this fundamental idea and has concisely stated it thus: "What is this principle? It is, that the physical can be the vehicle of the spiritual, the visible of the invisible."³ The same principle is in operation when the "Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (Jno. 1: 14). Yet the physical does not necessarily of itself convey the spiritual, even though it may intensify it.

1. C. Wright, Op. cit., p. 694.

2. E. Scott, Op. cit., p. 125.

3. C. Wright, Op. cit., p. 691.

For the conveying of the spiritual through the physical is always conditioned upon faith, or the ability of the recipient to see the spiritual in the physical.

When this 'Sacramental Principle' is grasped, the distinction between Christ conveying himself by means of his word and conveying himself through the Eucharist no longer becomes significant. The spirit is in the Eucharist because it is the symbol of the word of Christ to men (6:63). But the word of Christ reveals that which is more fundamental about him. After quoting the sayings of Jesus about the efficacy of his words, C.J. Wright continues: "These passages makes clear that when the 'word' of Jesus is spoken of, what is meant is, not what we mean by a word, but the essential inner mind which Jesus expresses. Those who have this have eternal life."¹ The word of Christ certainly frees from death and brings judgment (5: 24; 8: 51, 52; 12: 47, 48). Knowing God is parallel to keeping his word (8: 55). To believe in Christ is to have God's word abiding within. E.F. Scott, although rejecting this view, admits: "The words, pregnant with spirit and life, are in a manner Himself, and he can say in one breath, 'If ye abide in Me and My words abide in you' (15: 7)."² Scott

1. Ibid., p. 679.

2. Op. cit., p. 285.

has erred however in his arbitrary division of the words of Christ on himself as Bread, from those on his mystical union with believers.

Commentators would possibly cease to puzzle over the discourse on the Bread of Life if this Sacramental Principle, which begins with the Logos Christology, were applied. To be sure, John regards the sacrament of the Church as the body and blood of Christ (6: 53), and no doubt Ignatius regarded it as the "medicine of immortality."¹ But John says specifically that Jesus is speaking symbolically, and that the bread is the symbol of his spirit and his words; "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (6: 63). The Sacrament had no validity except as it conveys the spirit of Christ which is life - that is the final note struck in the discourse on the Bread of Life, and that is the key to the interpretation of the whole. As a simple matter of logic, the Word becoming flesh, implying that the divine enters into the human, contradicts any literal interpretation of the flesh of Christ being the bread from heaven, since the fleshly part is not the heavenly, but the earthy part of Christ. Furthermore, the contrast between the manna from heaven and the bread of life which

1. Eph. 20.

Christ offers, is a contrast between material bread which gave temporary sustenance and the presence of Christ imparted through his death. Only through his death is the mind of the Master and his presence completely known.

"The essence of believing communion is a reasonable intercourse of spirit with spirit, mediated to the disciple through the life-giving word and mind of the Master. Such appropriation of Christ in the spirit brings life to the communicant, the rest is figure or symbol."¹

Similarly, the mystical union with Christ is a communion with the mind of Christ. To have Christ as a living presence within, is to be the object of his love through obedience to his law of love, and thus to participate in his spirit (15: 10-12). Since to have Christ's words within is to abide in him, the same relation as that of Christ with God is thereby established for the believer (15: 7). Abiding in Christ is therefore obeying him as he has obeyed the Father (15: 10). This must again imply having the mind of Christ in so far as that mind includes a man's will. Similarly, the joy of Christ is that of the disciples, when they participate in his mind as it is imparted to them in his words (15: 11). The essential relationship is this:

1. W. Manson, Op. cit., p. 122.

Christ is the embodiment of God's love as well as His commandment for man, yet at the same time Christ is the medium of both of these to men and is thereby the mediator of life. Christ's consciousness of the love of God makes him conscious of a new love toward men which is rooted in the love of God toward him. In like manner his disciples are recipients of his love and in turn love one another (15:12; I Jno. 4:19). The very test of love toward God is love toward the brethren (I Jno. 4:20).

The Johannine writings are closely akin to the teaching of Jesus on love. Jesus saw in the manifest love of God the motive for the love of man to his fellow (Mat. 5:43-48 - Lk. 6:27-38). However, not the love of friends but the love of enemies is the final test of discipleship so that in the Synoptic teaching the scope of love is much wider than in John. Between the time of the writing of the Synoptic Gospels and of John terrible persecutions had marked the world as the enemy of the Church. Consequently, loyalty and love among the members of the church were essential to self-preservation and to the prevention of division in the midst of persecutions. The world's hatred of the disciples was preceded by its hatred of Christ himself. But underlying this was the sin which divided those of the world first from Christ and then from his

disciples. According to John, therefore, it is impossible for those outside of the Church to be in the fellowship of love, because there is no fellowship or love among sinners for those of Christ (Jno. 15:17-27).

It is this intimate relation of righteousness and love which makes it also a sign of the true life in the disciples (I Jno. 3:14). The sinner hates the brethren because they reveal his true nature. Hence it is impossible for him to participate in the brotherhood in Christ, and this hatred itself is a sign that he is no longer a possessor of the true life but "abideth in death." (I Jno. 3:14; cf. 2:15 ff.). Fundamentally, his attitude toward the brethren reveals his attitude toward God Himself, and his communion with God is indicated by his active love of his brethren (3:17; cf. 2:29).¹ Therein lies the relation between eternal life, which is ultimately communion with God, and love of the brethren, which is indicative of the believer's possession of eternal life.²

Love is viewed by John, both as a possession of the believer and as a relationship among the brethren.

1. Cf. S. Schweitzen, The Mysticism of St. Paul the Apostle, p. 352.

2. Cf. H. Holtzmann and W. Bauer, Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes, p. 344, who also present this view most lucidly and forcibly.

Because of the principle of unity in the spiritual world, individuality is only complete in the group. There is no explicit statement what the attitude of the believer beyond this group should be. The tenor of the Gospel and epistles would suggest that his attitude would be one of aloofness toward the unbeliever,¹ except in bringing him to the persuasion of his message. No real basis of love can exist without the appropriation of the love of God through Christ.

From the manward side, life is appropriated by faith in and knowledge of Christ and God. The sacramental Principle must also be observed in viewing the appropriation of life from the manward side. Man is presented with the spiritual or heavenly in the physical. That is the significance of the signs of Jesus. Although the people "behold" Christ's signs, still he will not trust himself to them, so that the people seek vainly to make him king by force (Jno. 6:2). People may do no more than "behold" (θεωπεῖν) Christ and consider him as a wonder worker, but then again they may behold and believe on Christ as the Messianic Son of God. Beholding Christ and believing on him are linked

1. Contr. H. Holtzmann and W. Bauer, Ibid., p. 344, who feel that love of the believer toward the unbeliever is implied. Cf. Jno. 17:9,20; I Jno. 4:1-6. Cf. P. Gardner, The Ephesian Gospel, p. 137 f; "certainly he (the author) holds that the love of one member of the Church for another must be wholly different from the love of a Christian for one outside the community," p. 138.

together when John seeks to convey the fact that Christ represents the Father (12:44,45).

"Beholding" in the later chapters takes on a spiritual significance so as to refer to the spiritual sight of the disciples as well as the physical sight of those who are of the world. The world is unable to "behold" either the Spirit or Christ, but the disciples continue to behold them (14:17-19).¹ In the early part of the Gospel "seeing" (ὁρᾶν) "is repeatedly used of spiritual promise" (1:39,50,51; 11:40), and is related also to Christ seeing us (16:22).² But in the post-resurrection narrative mere "seeing" is inferior to believing: "Blessed are they that have not seen (ἰδόντες) and have believed" (20:29). In these instances the appropriation of spiritual life and reality through the physical is repeatedly presented. The vocabulary is not definitive and the words shift from their application to the physical to the spiritual, precisely because John wants to make this change sufficiently obvious.

There is a marked difference between Johannine faith, and faith as it is in the Synoptic Gospels. Miracles in the Synoptic Gospels are conditioned by faith, while in John faith is represented as the product of miracles.³

1. E. Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary, pp. 105, 106.

2. Ibid., p. 105 f.

3. E. Scott, Op.cit., p. 268 f.

"He manifested forth his glory, and his disciples believed on him" (2:11). "Believe me for the very works' sake" (14:11). But John uses the term "believe" quite as freely as he does the terms "see" and "behold" to express, first the perception of and reliance upon the outward manifestations of Christ, and thereby the perception and reliance upon the inward meaning of the symbol. Nathaniel is represented as beginning with belief in a sign, but he is promised "a more spiritual basis for a higher kind of belief."¹ Trusting the Scriptures and the interpretation which they offer of Christ leads to spiritual awareness of the significance of Christ as the bringer of life (2:22, 20:9, 5:39). To believe in miracles as signs is to understand their significance, and not simply to be gratified at the benefits which they render to men. This is the basis of the rebuke of Jesus when after the feeding of the five thousand they come to him for more such signs. If they had seen that of which the miracles were the symbol, they would have trusted Jesus as the bread of life (Jno. 6:26 ff.).

Faith, in the Johannine writings, is not alone to be explained by the Sacramental Principle, but is further related to the Synoptic and Pauline teaching about faith by

1. E. Abbott, Op. cit., p. 38.

the telescoping of eschatology into the present. Belief is, for Paul, receiving the future age as if it were already present, and appropriating the life of the eschaton for the present. Johannine belief has also retained in a measure the eschatological aspect. This aspect appears in the calling of Nathanael who received a preliminary sign which aroused belief, but Jesus says that the complete revelation of himself to Nathanael as the Son of Man is yet to come. However, the implication is that Nathanael will come to full belief in Jesus as God's self-revelation to men.¹ The representation of the angels ascending and descending on the Son of Man shows that faith is not only apprehending something in the future, but apprehending a vertical relationship between the sphere of the world and the sphere of heaven. The promises cease to relate so much to the eschatological future as to the present heavenly reality before which men are forced to make a decision.²

E. F. Scott again falls into his prevailing weakness in the over analysis of John's use of terms when he says: "To 'believe' is to grant the hypothesis that Jesus was

1. E. Abbott, Op. cit., p. 38.

2. R. Bultmann, Op. cit., Band II, Lief. 14, p. 872.

indeed the Christ, the Son of God.¹ Scott goes further to say that this is not all, that trust is also demanded in the person of Jesus. But this leaves a gap unfilled between the assent to a fact and the relation to a person. Between these two, lies the whole principle of revelation, or the Sacramental Principle, i.e., that facts about the miraculous historical person of Jesus are the vehicle by which he is received as the supernatural Son of God, in view of which believers live the supernatural life in their historical situation (20: 31; 17: 15, 16).

Viewing it as Scott does, belief follows rather than precedes knowledge. However, he has perhaps attempted to read the modern scientific method into a first century writing. By this method there is first the examination of the facts, then the erection of a hypothesis.² The facts can be known; the hypothesis is only subject to belief, and is therefore secondarily reached. E.A. Abbott has shown through his painstaking review of the passages involved that belief precedes knowledge in the instance where the two occur in the Gospel to indicate stages in the perception of spiritual truth, and that where knowing

1. Op. cit., p. 267.

2. Ibid., p. 271.

precedes believing the two act as a compound verb with relation to the object, the one enforcing the other.¹ Bernard is also of this opinion, that belief precedes knowledge as indicated in Peter's confession (6: 69), "We have believed and know (perfect) that thou are the holy one of God."² In the other instance in which know and believe occur together, "that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father," the word for "understand" is rendered πιστεύετε³ in certain texts, while in others γινώσκετε⁴ occurs.¹ Westcott and Hort prefer the latter. If it is to be received, it confirms the view that knowledge is an advanced stage in spiritual perception.

Belief and knowledge have a more basic function in the Johannine writings than to establish the reality of a spiritual sphere in the mind of believers. Belief and knowledge are also the recognition and trust of Jesus as the Son of God. Trust in Jesus gives validity to what Jesus says, in the mind of the believer. Mistrust of what Jesus says about earthly things is indicative of a lack of confidence in what Jesus has to say of heavenly things (3:12).

1. Op. cit., p. 125.

2. Op. cit., Vol. I., p. 222.

3. Cf. BLX, cursives and versions.

4. Cf. Ν A.

Trust in the person of Jesus is thus presupposed for belief in what he says (4: 21).

Trust in Jesus is that condition which precedes abiding in him: it is becoming enamoured of his personality, being drawn into him so that all things are seen and experienced through Jesus' eyes.¹ That is the reason that receiving or believing on Jesus' name gives authority to become a son of God (1: 12). He who has experienced this has eternal life, because he is no longer in darkness but in light (3: 16-21).

But the final word has yet to be said. John steps out of the dogmatic circle of many of his contemporaries. He tells the world that the discovery of life in Christ is as wide as the moral experience of man when he says, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (7: 17). John is offering the world a moral challenge. Belief cannot be separated from the moral challenge of obedience (3:36). The beginnings of the discovery of the new life which Christ gives is rooted in a willingness to do God's will, because Christ represents for John the will of God in action (5: 30; 6: 38, 39). God is responsive only to that man who does his will (9: 31), and in turn man knows God only in the utter willingness to do his will.

1. Cf. E.A. Abbott, Op. cit., p. 45.

Nineteen centuries have passed. The challenge remains. It means facing the whole of life with absolute willingness to forego all for the will of God. It may be called absolute surrender, or absolute abandonment, or the decision for God only. Whatever name it assumes, this challenge contains within it the ultimate condition for life. The only possibility of abiding in Christ is to participate in the same meat which was food for him when he said, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to accomplish His work" (4: 34). If Christ is the bread of life, he is so because he represents the perfect expression of the will of God. To participate in him is to participate in that bread. Trust in Christ must inevitably include complete obedience to the will of God. And as has already been intimated, knowledge depends upon willingness to do the will of God. Love is the inevitable expression of that Will. The light of this magnificent message of John is flickering feebly today in a war-torn, wretched world struggling to bring life and abundance. O that men were inflamed with it to spread it abroad, that it might blaze to the heavens, "Peace on earth toward men of God's will."

CONCLUSION.

A brief summary of the previous chapters will reveal certain important aspects in the development of the conception of life in the Synoptic, Pauline, and Johannine writings. Such a survey will bring these aspects into fuller relief and will embody the conclusions already intimated in the previous discussion.

First of all, the New Testament emerges as a record of the thoughts and acts of men in relation to their own particular heritage and environment. An attempt to make a critical discovery of the conception of New Testament life apart from an understanding of the events and the thought mould of the age would be quite futile. The age put its peculiar stamp upon the contemporaneous interpretation of the Old Testament. In those times of crisis, the conception of life which was derived from the Scriptures and elucidated in contemporaneous literature needed to be chiefly other-worldly. The political and moral chaos of Jesus' environment (outwardly pious and undisturbed though it may have seemed), and the moral chaos which Paul discovered on his missionary journeys were receptive to a message of the hope of God's ultimate vindication of the righteous in a future

life in order to justify their courage in a hostile world. However, the early Church, because of an unrealized Parousia, began increasingly to emphasize what Jesus and Paul had already intimated, i.e., that the vindication of the righteous by the gift of eternal life did not await the consummation, but was already present in the man who in union with Jesus Christ lived his life solely within the will of God in a relationship of trust. This is the discovery consummated by the author of the Fourth Gospel, influenced as he seems to have been by Hellenistic ideas. Therefore, the development of the conception of life in the Synoptic, Pauline, and Johannine writings is in a large measure an event emerging in and controlled by the history of the times.

In the Synoptic teaching of Jesus, we perceive the beginnings of the idea that life in the coming aeon is already emerging in history. Contemporaneous thought in almost every eschatological writing save in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which is the closest akin to the teachings of Jesus, conceived of this life as a life only in the future age. However, Jesus indicated that while this life in the Kingdom was only complete in the consummation of the Kingdom, it nevertheless had its beginnings in him who turned, gave up all, and followed Jesus in complete obedience and trust in God's will. The ethic of the Sermon

on the Mount discloses a completely new orientation of man's life to God in meeting his specific life situations. Moreover, the fact is difficult to evade that Jesus' teaching about the life of the eschaton was disclosed in the very essence of his person as he lived it daily and was condemned on a cross because of it.

Yet on the other hand, Jesus' followers were taught that they live in the present wholly with a view to the life to come. It was this imminence of the coming Kingdom which made those who were living with a view to it actually members of it already. The ethical transformation was already in the process of realization in those who were claimed for the Kingdom. They were living under the sovereign will of God; they were living in trust, taking all from His hand, neither expecting nor wanting anything more. They had been willing to choose death as the outcome for the true life's sake. This meant that they were living as revolutionaries in the present world, but inaugurating a revolution by love, even to the point of going to a cross, instead of by the sword.

Again, the conception of life in the Pauline writings is an historical emergence but of a different kind. The teaching arose not so much out of a clash of activity with the status quo as in the case of Jesus, as out of a clash and interaction with the ideas of the age. Paul was

confronted with the Gnostic and Mystery intermediaries and lords with their redeemer-myths. He saw in Jesus the Lord above all lords and the historical fulfillment of redemption. Paul furthermore adopted the conception of the dying and rising with Christ which is similar in some respects to the Mystery redeemer-myths. Finally, he adapted the Gnostic idea of a redeemer who begins a new humanity, to the idea of a new humanity begun in Christ.

However, Paul's view had its roots in the Jewish Rabbinism and eschatology of his day; but he conceived of the eschaton as already inaugurated at the resurrection of Jesus with the outpouring of the Spirit. Like Jesus, he thought of this new life as a life under the direct control of God with no intervening Law, for Paul found the Jewish legalism a stumbling block to himself as well as others; but he could not sweep it aside and come into direct relationship with God so easily as Jesus had. Instead, he discovered in the cross the final fulfillment of the law of death-for-sin which answered the legalism of the Judaizers as well as his own, as a condition for life in fellowship with God. By entering into Christ through dying and rising with him, the believer had fulfilled the Law and was living the new risen life in its beginnings although the actual transformation of the body occurs at the Parousia. It is the Spirit which

raised Jesus from the dead which was actually the center from which would proceed a new way of life for the believer.

Again the conception of 'life' in John is an emergence in an historical situation. The Church had begun to crystallize its practices and creeds. The break with Judaism was now complete. Gnostic influences were bearing fruit. The Jesus of history had become the Word of God made flesh. He was the embodiment of the life of the eschaton and had imparted that very life during his earthly ministry as well as after his resurrection. While the Johannine writings follow chronologically the Synoptic and Pauline writings thus representing a later point of view, they nevertheless serve as a bridge between the synoptic and Pauline views by associating the historical Jesus of the Synoptics with the glorified Christ of Paul. The Johannine writings may be said to stand at the apex of a triangle, the two base angles of which are the Synoptic and Pauline writings, for the principle of the incarnation was the fulfillment of the conception that the historical Jesus and the glorified Christ are at one in embodying and bestowing the life of God upon the believer. Thus, due to this telescoping of the eschatology of the Synoptic and Pauline writings, eternal life was conceived - even in the Johannine teaching - as a constant, the same in every age, and completely beyond history,

a life which is totally different in expression but basically the same today as that to which Jesus first called his disciples.

One other aspect binds this first-century conception of the Christian life to the present day. That is the factor of Christian experience. Jesus, Paul, and John had within themselves an experience of God to which they called others - a new life which was not simply communicated by them, but communicated through them. The records show that the new life was communicated chiefly by testifying and exhibiting it, rather than by explaining it. This life-to-life communication binds the Christian life today to that of the first century. Following Jesus to the cross, dying and rising with him, living in intimate, obedient communion with God through Christ - these aspects of the true life cannot be described - they can only be experienced.

The final and ultimate question arises, the one question which makes this study worthy of the time and labor expended upon it as a contribution to life, or leaves it as another specimen of research, interesting but of little positive value to present day living. It is the question whether the conception of life in these writings is purely a first century emergence due to the stress of the times, and is only of interest as another phase of the history of

religions; or whether this new life of complete trust, lived within the absolute will of God in Christ, and constantly communicated to others, is also possible today. Does God indeed have this as the answer for the war, hatred, strife, lust, pettiness, greed, slums, and tyranny in the world to-day? May we today have the abundant life of "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control" in taking up the cross with one who lived two thousand years ago so that God's Kingdom may come, His will be done on earth?

An honest answer to this question requires one to be personal. Where one has met the conditions which have emerged in this study, of the completely surrendered life which is constantly outgoing through sharing by word and deed the love of God toward all, this very new life-abundant gushes forth from within one like a bubbling spring. A new creation emerges: "The old things have passed away; behold, they are become new." And with this increasing power through the committed life, there grows the conviction that God has the answer for the world through witnessing sharing lives which are wholly His. Such a movement must inevitably and radically change the world - politically, socially, and economically, as well as individually. The whole outlook

of the world is changed. Instead of seeing life as a riddle, one sees it with God's answer. And the answer lies in the immortal paradox of Jesus, that they who willfully seek life for themselves, must lose it; but they who do willingly lose their life in following him, shall find it, not only for themselves but for the world as well.

A.	Sources and General Commentaries ...	(1)
	1. - Lexicons, Texts, and Concordances...	(1)
	2. - Primary Sources and Bible Dictionaries.	(2)
	3. - General Commentaries...	(3)
B.	The New Testament Age ...	(5)
	1. - The Jewish World...	(5)
	2. - The Pagan World...	(6)
C.	Jesus ...	(8)
	1. - The Life and Teaching of Jesus ...	(8)
	2. - Commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels.	(12)
D.	Paul ...	(14)
	1. - The Life and Teaching of Paul ...	(14)
	2. - Commentaries on the Epistles ...	(15)
E.	The Fourth Gospel ...	(19)
F.	General Critical and Historical Materials ...	(22)
	1. - Books ...	(22)
	2. - Journals ...	(24)

*The asterisk before the title of a book indicates that special weight has been given it in the development of the thesis. Subtitles are included in the listing of books only where the subtitle indicates something of value as to the content of a book.

Commentaries are sometimes indicated in the thesis by the author of the commentary and the name of the book of the Bible. Other instances where the title is shortened are indicated in parentheses in the Bibliography.

A. Sources and General Commentaries.

1. - Lexicons, Texts, and Concordances.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Brown, Francis:
Driver, S.R.:
Briggs, C.A.: | <u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of
the Old Testament.</u> Based on
the <u>Lexicon of William Gesenius.</u>
Trans. by Edward Robinson.
Oxford. 1906. |
| Gwatkin, H.M.: | <u>Selections from Early Writings,
Illustrative of Church History
to the Time of Constantine.</u>
London. 1929. |
| Hatch, Edwin:
Redpath, H.A.: | <u>A Concordance to the Septuagint.</u>
Oxford. 1897. |
| Kittel, Rudolph: | <u>Biblica Hebraica.</u>
Stuttgart. 1912. |
| Moulton, W.F.:
Geden, A.S.:
(Editors). | <u>A Concordance to the Greek
Testament.</u> Second Edition.
Edinburgh. 1899. |
| Swete, H.B.: | <u>The Old Testament in Greek.</u>
Fourth Edition. Cambridge. 1925. |
| Thayer, H.T.: | <u>A Greek Lexicon of the New Testa-
ment.</u> Fourth Edition.
Edinburgh. 1901. |
| Tischendorf, Constantius: | <u>Vetus Testamentum Graece: Iuxta
LXX Interpretes.</u>
Lipsae. 1856. |
| Westcott, B.F.:
Hort, F.J.A.: | <u>The New Testament in the
Original Greek.</u>
Cambridge. 1881. |
| Young, Robert: | <u>Analytical Concordance to the
Bible.</u> Seventh Edition.
No Date. |

2. - Primary Sources and Bible Dictionaries.

- Basore, J.W.:
(Translator). Seneca: Moral Essays. Three Volumes. (Loeb Library of Classics). London. 1928.
- Burton, E.D.: A Source Book for the Study of the Teaching of Jesus in Its Historical Relationships. Chicago. 1924.
- Charles, R.H.:
(Translator). *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. Oxford. 1912.
*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. London. 1908.
- Cheyne, T.K.:
(Editor). Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary of the Bible. Four Volumes. London. 1899-1903.
- Hastings, James:
Selbie, J.A. and
Lambert, J.C.:
(Associate Editors). A Dictionary of the Bible. Five Volumes. Edinburgh. 1900.
Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Thirteen Volumes. Edinburgh. 1915.
A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Two Volumes. Edinburgh. 1908.
- Lake, Kirsopp:
(Translator). The Apostolic Fathers. Two Volumes. (Loeb Library of Classics). New York. 1912.
- James, M.R.:
(Translator). The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford. 1924.
- Kittell, Gerhard: *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Band I. Lieferung 9-10. K. L. Schmidt - "Bassileia". Stuttgart. 1933.

Kittell, Gerhard:
(Continued)

* Ibid. Band II, Lieferungen 12-13
and 14. G. von Rad, G. Bertram,
and R. Bultmann - "Zoe".
Stuttgart. 1935.

Matheson, P.E.:
(Translator)

Epictetus. The Discourses and
Manual. Two Volumes.
Oxford. 1916.

Milligan, George:
Moulton, J.H.:

The Vocabulary of the Greek Testa-
ment, Illustrated from the Papyri
and Other Non-literary Sources.
Part III.
London. 1919.

Oesterly, W.O.E.:
Box, G.H.:
(Editors)

Translations of Early Documents.
Series I. Palestinian Jewish Texts.
London. 1917-1919.

Scott, Walter:
(Translator)
(Editor)

Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and
Latin Writings Which Contain Re-
ligious or Philosophic Teachings
Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus.
Four Volumes. Vol. II. 1925.
Oxford. 1925-1936.

Thackeray, H.S.:
(Translator)

* Josephus. (Loeb Library of
Classics). The Jewish Wars.
Books 1-7. Jewish Antiquities.
Books 1-8.
New York. 1930.

Trench, R.C.:

Synonymns of the New Testament.
London. 1901.

Whiston, William:
(Translator)

* The Works of Flavius Josephus.
London. 1806.

3. - General Commentaries.*

Driver, S.R.:
Plummer, Alfred:
Briggs, C.A.:

The International Critical
Commentary.
Edinburgh. 1896-1928 (ICC).

* The important individual books are listed below. The initials or terms by which they are generally designated are indicated in parentheses. The volumes of Lietzmann's Hb.NT. were used somewhat but not listed elsewhere in the Bibliography.

- Holtzmann, H.S.: Hand-commentar zum Neuen Testament.
Tübingen. 1908. (HKNT).
- Lietzmann, Hans: Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.
Zweite Auflage.
Tübingen. 1923-1927. (Hb.NT).
- Lock, Walter: Westminster Commentaries.
London. 1925. (WC).
- Meyer, H.A.W.: Kritische-exegetischer Kommentar
über das Neue Testament.
Begründet von H.G.W.Meyer. Von
der 7. Auflage an bearbeitet
von Bernhard Weiss.
Göttingen. 1902-1912.
Critical and Exegetical Commentary
on the New Testament. Trans. by
P. Christie from the Sixth Edn.
Edinburgh. 1880.
- Moffatt, James: The Moffat New Testament
Commentary.
London. 1930-1936. (Moffatt Com.).
- Nicoll, W.R.: The Expositor's Greek Testament.
New York. 1900-1903. (EGT).
- Oxon, Thomas:
Wild, Herbert:
Box, G.H.: The Clarendon Bible.
Oxford. 1923-1936. (Cl).
- Strack, H.L.: Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus
Billerbeck, Paul: Talmud und Midrash. Vier
Bände. München. 1922-1928.
(Strack-Billerbeck).
- Peake, A.S.: A Commentary on the Bible by
Various Contributors. Edited
by A.S.Peake with the Assistance
for the New Testament of
A. J. Grieve, London.
London. 1919.
- Weiss, Johannes: Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments.
Zwei Bände. Göttingen. 1907.

B. The New Testament Age.

1. - The Jewish World.

- Abrahams, I.: Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. First Series.
Cambridge. 1917.
- Bindley, T. H.: Religious Thought in Palestine in the Time of Christ.
London. 1931.
- Booth, H. K.: The World of Jesus: A Survey of the Background of the Gospels.
London. 1933.
- Bousset, Wilhelm: *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.
Berlin. 1906.
- Charles, R.H.: *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. (Eschatology).
London. Second Edition. 1913.
- Cohen, A.: Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity.
Burkitt, F.C.:
and Others: London. 1923.
- Kohler, K.: Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered.
New York. 1918.
- Moore, G.F.: *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. Two Vols.
Cambridge. 1927-1930.
- Rankin, O.S.: Israel's Wisdom Literature, Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion.
Edinburgh. 1936.
- Schechter, S.: Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.
London. 1909.
Studies in Judaism. Second Series.
Philadelphia. 1908.

Schürer, Emil:

*A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.
Five Volumes and Index. Trans.
by J. Macpherson.
Edinburgh. 1890.

2. - The Pagan World.

Angus, S.:

The Environment of Early Christianity.
London. 1914.

The Mystery-Religions and Christianity: A Study in the Religious Background of Early Christianity.
London. 1925.

The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World.
London. 1929.

Bevan, Edwyn:

Hellenism and Christianity.
London. 1921.

Bonhöffer, Adolf:

Epiktet und das Neue Testament.
Giessen. 1911.

Cumont, Franz:

After Life in Roman Paganism.
New Haven. 1922.

Les Mysteres de Mithra.
Troiseme Edition.
Bruxelles. 1915.

The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.
Chicago. 1911.

Deissmann, G.A.:

Light from the Ancient East.
The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World. Trans.
by R.M. Strachan. Revised Edition.
London. 1927.

Dodd, C.H.:

*The Bible and the Greeks.
London. 1935.

Glover, T.R.:

The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. Sixth Edn. London. 1917.

The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World. Cambridge. 1929.

The World of the New Testament. Cambridge. 1931.

Harnack, Adolph:

The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Trans. by J. Moffatt. Vol.I. London. 1904.

Kennedy, H.A.A.:

Philo's Contribution to Religion. London. 1919.

Legge, F.:

Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity: Being Studies in Religious History from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D. Two volumes. Cambridge. 1915.

Loisy, Alfred:

Le Mandéisme et les origines Chrétiennes. Paris. 1934.

Murray, Gilbert:

Five Stages of Greek Religion. Oxford. 1925.

Reitzenstein, R.:

*Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig. 1927.

Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium. Bonn. 1921.

Rhode, Erwin:

Psyche, the Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks. Trans. by W.B.Hillis, London. 1925.

Wendland, Paul:

Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum. Tübingen. 1907.

C. Jesus.

1. - The Life and Teaching of Jesus.

- Baldensperger, W.: Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit. Strassburg. 1888.
- Bosworth, E.I.: The Life and Teaching of Jesus, According to the First Three Gospels. New York. 1924. .
- Bousset, Wilhelm: Jesus. Trans. by J.P.Trevelyan. New York. 1906.
- Bruce, A.B.: The Kingdom of God. Edinburgh. 1889.
The Parabolic Teaching of Christ. London. 1887.
- Bultmann, Rudolph: *Jesus and the Word. Trans. by L.P.Smith and E. Huntress. London. 1935.
- Burkitt, F.C.: The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. Boston and New York. 1910.
- Burton, E.D. and Matthews, Shailer: The Life of Christ. Third Edition. Chicago. 1927.
- Cadoux, A.T.: The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use. London. No Date.
- Candlish, J.S.: The Kingdom of God, Biblically and Historically Considered. Edinburgh. 1884.
- Case, S.J.: Jesus, A New Biography. Chicago. 1927.
- Dalman, Gustaf: *Jesus - Jeshua, Studies in the Gospels. Trans. by P.P.Levertoff. London. 1929.
*The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language. Trans. by D.Kay. Edinburgh. 1902.

- Dodschtz, E. von: The Eschatology of the Gospels.
London. 1910.
- Dodd, C.H.: *The Parables of the Kingdom.
London. 1936.
- Drummond, J.: The Way of Life. Vol. I:
The Parables of Jesus.
London. 1918.
- Du Bose, W.P.: The Gospel in the Gospels.
London. 1906.
- Edersheim, Alfred: The Life and Times of Jesus the
Messiah. Two Volumes.
New York. 1906.
- Fairbairn, A.M.: Studies in the Life of Christ.
Twelfth Edition.
London. 1900.
- Findlay, J.A.: What Did Jesus Teach?
London. 1933.
- Geikie, Cunningham: The Life and Words of Christ.
Two Volumes.
London. 1883.
- Gilbert, G.H.: The First Interpreters of Jesus.
New York. 1901.
- Glover, T.R.: The Jesus of History.
London. 1917.
- Goebel, S.: The Parables of Jesus. Trans.
by Prof. Banks.
Edinburgh. 1883.
- Goguel, Maurice: *The Life of Jesus. Trans. by
Olive Wyon.
London. 1933.
La Vie de Jesus.
Paris. 1932.
- Gore, Charles: The Sermon on the Mount,
A Practical Exposition.
London. 1897.

- Guignebert, Charles: *Jesus. London. 1935.
- Harnack, Adolph: The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Trans. by J.R. Wilkinson. London. 1908.
- Headlam, A.C.: The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ. London. 1923.
- Hogg, A.G.: Christ's Message of the Kingdom. Edinburgh. 1912.
- Holtzmann, Oscar: The Life of Jesus. Trans. by J.T. Bealby and M. A. Canney. London. 1904.
- King, H.C.: The Ethics of Jesus. New York. 1912.
- Klausner, Joseph: *Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Times and His Teaching. Trans. by H. Danby. London. 1925.
- Laidlaw, John: Studies in the Parables. London. 1907.
- Mackinnon, James: The Historic Jesus. London. 1931.
- Manson, T.W.: The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content. Cambridge. 1931.
- Manson, William: *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God: A Study in Jewish Apocalyptic and in the Mind of Jesus Christ. London. 1918.
- Moffatt, James: The Theology of the Gospels. London. 1912.
- Montefiore, C.G.: Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus According to the Synoptic Gospels. London. 1910.

- Muirhead, L.A.: The Eschatology of Jesus or the Kingdom Come and Coming.
London. 1904.
- Noel, Conrad: The Life of Jesus.
London. 1937.
- Otto, Rudolph: *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn: Ein Religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch.
München. 1934.
- Piepenbring, Charles: The Historical Jesus. Trans. by L. Clare.
London. 1924.
- Rall, H.F.: The Teaching of Jesus.
New York. 1930.
- Ross, D.M.: The Teaching of Jesus.
Edinburgh. 1904.
- Sanday, William: Outline of the Life of Christ.
Edinburgh. 1906.
- Schmidt, Nathaniel: The Prophet of Nazareth.
New York. 1905.
- Schweitzer, Albert: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede.
Trans. by W. Montgomery.
London. 1910.
- Scott, C.A.A.: New Testament Ethics.
London. 1930.
- Scott, E.F.: *The Kingdom and the Messiah.
Edinburgh. 1911.
The Kingdom of God in the New Testament.
New York. 1931.
- Sharman, H.B.: The Teaching of Jesus about the Future According to the Synoptic Gospels.
Chicago. 1909.

- Stevens, G.B.: The Teaching of Jesus.
New York. 1907.
- Walker, Thomas: The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age.
London. 1923.
- Warschauer, J.: The Historical Life of Christ.
London. 1927.
- Weiss, Johannes: Die Predigt Jesu vom Reich Gottes.
Göttingen. 1900.
- Wendt, H.H.: *The Teaching of Jesus. Trans. by
John Wilson. Two Volumes.
Edinburgh. 1892.
- Winstanley, E.W.: Jesus and the Future.
Edinburgh. 1913.
- Wrede, W.: Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien.
Göttingen. 1901.

2. - Commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels.

- Allen, W.C.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. (ICC).
Edinburgh. 1907.
- Bruce, A.B.: The Synoptic Gospels.
New York. 1902.
- Creed, J.M.: *The Gospel according to St. Luke.
London. 1930.
- Easton, B.S.: *The Gospel according to Luke.
Edinburgh. 1926.
- Gould, E.P.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark. (ICC).
Edinburgh. 1896.

- Lagrange, M.J.: Evangile selon Saint Matthieu.
Paris. 1923.
- McNeile, A.H.: The Gospel according to St. Matthew.
London. 1915.
- Major, H.D.:
Manson, T.W.:
Wright, C.J.: *The Mission and Message of Jesus.
London. 1937.
- Manson, William: The Gospel of St. Luke. (Moffatt Com.)
London. 1930.
- Montefiore, C.G.: *The Synoptic Gospels. Two
Volumes. London. First Edition:
Second Edition: 1927.
- Plummer, Alfred: A Critical and Exegetical Commen-
tary on the Gospel according
to St. Luke.
Edinburgh. 1896.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J.: St. Mark with Introduction, Com-
mentary, and Additional Notes. (WC)
London. 1925.
- Robinson, T.H.: The Gospel of Matthew.
London. 1928.
- Swete, H.B.: The Gospel according to St. Mark.
London. 1898.
- Weiss, Johannes: Das Älteste Evangelium.
Göttingen. 1903.
- Wellhausen, Julius: Das Evangelium Lucae.
Berlin. 1904.
Das Evangelium Marci.
Berlin., 1903.

D. Paul.

1. - The Life and Teaching of Paul.

- Bacon, B. W.: Jesus and Paul. London. 1921.
- Deissmann, G. A.: The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. Trans. by W. E. Wilson. London. 1926.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J.: The Life of Saint Paul, the Man and the Apostle. London. No date.
- Gardner, Percy: The Religious Experience of St. Paul. London. 1913.
- Glover, T. R.: Paul of Tarsus. London. 1925.
- Kennedy, H. A. A.: The Theology of the Epistles. London. 1919.
*St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. London. 1913.
*St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things. London. 1904.
- Montefiore, C. G.: Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays. London. 1914.
- Morgan, William: The Religion and Theology of Paul. Edinburgh. 1917.
- Pfleiderer, Otto: *Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology. Two Volumes. Trans. by Edward Peters. Edinburgh. 1877.
- Ramsay, W. M.: The Cities of St. Paul, Their Influence on His Life and Thought. London. 1907.
The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day. London. 1913.

- Schweitzer, Albert: The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Trans. by W. Montgomery. London. 1931.
Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History. Trans. by W. Montgomery. London. 1912.
- Scott, C.A.A.: Footnotes to St. Paul. Cambridge. 1935.
- Stewart, J. S.: A Man in Christ: The Vital Elements in St. Paul's Religion. London. 1935.
- Wrede, W.: Paul. Trans. by E. Lumis. London. 1907.

2. - Commentaries on the Epistles.

- Abbott, T. K.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1897.
- Barth, Karl: The Epistle to the Romans. Trans. by E. C. Hoskyns from the Sixth Edition. London. 1933.
- Bernard, J. H.: The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. (EGT). New York. 1903.
- Burton, E. D.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. (ICC). New York. 1920.
- Denney, James: St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. (EGT). London. 1901.
- Duncan, G. S.: The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. (Moffatt Com.). London. 1934.

- Edwards, T. C.: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. London. 1885.
- Ellicott, C. J.: A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians with a Revised Translation. London. 1854.
- Evans, Ernest: The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. (Cl.). Oxford. 1930.
- Findlay, G. G.: St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. London. (EGT). 1901.
- Frame, J. E.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1912.
- Goodspeed, E. J.: The Meaning of Ephesians. Chicago. 1933.
- Gore, Charles: St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Practical Exposition. London. 1900.
St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: A Practical Exposition. Vol. I. London. 1900.
- Kennedy, H. A. A.: The Epistle to the Philippians. (EGT). New York. 1903.
- Goudge, H. L.: The First Epistle to the Corinthians. (WC). London. 1903.
- Lightfoot, J. B.: Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. Ninth Edition. London. 1890.
Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Sixth Edition. London. 1880.
Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. London. 1883.

- Lock, Walter: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles: I and II Timothy and Titus. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1924.
- Menzies, Allan: *The Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians. London. 1912.
- Michael, J. H.: The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians. (Moffatt Com.). London. 1928.
- Milligan, George: St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. London. 1908.
- Moule, H. C. G.: Ephesian Studies. London. 1900.
- Plummer, Alfred: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1915.
- Robertson, Archibald:
Plummer, Alfred: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1911.
- Robinson, J. A.: St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London. 1903.
- Sanday, William:
Headlam, A. C.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1902.
- Scott, E. F.: The Pastoral Epistles. (Moffatt Com.). London. 1936.
The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians. (Moffatt Com.). London. 1930.

Strachan, R. H.:

The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. (Moffatt Com.). London. 1935.

Vincent, M. R.:

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1897.

Weiss, Johannes:

*Der Erste Korintherbrief. (Meyer Com.). 9. Auflage. Göttingen. 1910.

E. The Fourth Gospel.

- Abbot, E. A.: *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three. London. 1905.
- Bacon, B. W.: The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. London. 1910.
- Bernard, A. H.: *The Gospel of John. Two Volumes. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1928.
- Brooke, A. E.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles. (ICC). Edinburgh. 1912.
- Burney, C. F.: *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford. 1922.
- Carpenter, J. E.: *The Johannine Writings: A Study of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. London. 1927.
- Dods, Marcus: The Gospel of St. John. (EGT). New York. 1902.
- Findlay, G. G.: Fellowship in the Life Eternal: An Exposition of the Epistles of St. John. London. 1909.
- Gardner, Percy: The Ephesian Gospel. London. 1915.
- Garvie, A. E.: The Beloved Disciple: Studies of the Fourth Gospel. London. 1922.
- Grill, Julius: *Untersuchung über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums. Erster Teil. Tübingen. 1902.
- Harris, J. R.: The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel. Cambridge. 1917.

- Holtzmann, H. J.: Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes. Besorgt von W. Bauer. (HKNT). Tübingen. 1908.
- Jackson, H. L.: The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent German Criticism. Cambridge. 1906.
- Lewis, F. W.: Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge. 1910.
- Lowrie, Walter: The Doctrine of Saint John: An Essay in Biblical Theology. New York. 1899.
- McGregor, G. H. C.: *The Gospel of John. (Moffatt Com.). London. 1928.
- Manson, William: *The Incarnate Glory: An Expository Study of the Gospel According to St. John. London. 1923.
- Muirhead, L. A.: The Message of the Fourth Gospel. London. 1925.
- Murray, J. O. F.: Jesus According to St. John. London. 1936.
- Odeberg, Hugo: *The Fourth Gospel, Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World. Uppsala. 1929.
- Scott, E. F.: *The Fourth Gospel; Its Purpose and Theology. Edinburgh. 1906.
- Stevens, G. B.: The Johannine Theology: A Study of the Doctrinal Content of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John. New York. 1894.

- Strachan, R. H.: The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment.
London. 1917.
- Wendt, H. H.: The Gospel According to St. John: An Enquiry into Its Genesis and Historical Value,
Trans. by E. Lummis. Edinburgh. 1902.
- Westcott, B. F.: *The Epistles of St. John.
London. 1892.
- The Gospel According to St. John. London. 1887.
- Wright, C. G.: The Meaning and Message of the Fourth Gospel. London. 1933.

F. General Critical and Historical Materials.

1. - Books.

- Bacon, B. W.: The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date. New Haven. 1925.
- Baillie, John: And the Life Everlasting. New York. 1933.
- Bousset, Wilhelm: Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. Göttingen. 1907.
Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Iranaeus. Göttingen. 1913.
- Bultmann, Rudolph: *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. First Edition. Göttingen. 1921.
- Burkitt, F. C.: The Gospel History and Its Transmission. Edinburgh. 1906.
Christian Beginnings. London. 1924.
- Carpenter, J. E.: The First Three Gospels: Their Origin and Relations. Third Edition. London. 1904.
- Case, S. J.: Studies in Early Christianity. New York. 1928.
- Dewick, E. C.: Primitive Christian Eschatology. Cambridge. 1912.
- Dodd, C. H.: *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. London. 1936.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J.: *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. Five Volumes. Vols. I and IV. London. 1920.
 Lake, Kirsopp:

- Holtzmann, H. J.: *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie. Two Volumes. Freiburg. 1897.
- Hügel, F. von: *Eternal Life: A Study of Its Implications and Applications. Edinburgh. 1912.
- Lietzmann, Hans: Geschichte der alten Kirche. Two Volumes. Vol. I. Berlin. 1936.
The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Trans. by B. L. Woolf. London. 1937.
- Loisy, Alfred: La Naissance du Christianisme. Paris. 1933.
- Macmurray, John: Reason and Emotion. London. 1935.
- Mathews, Shailer: The Messianic Hope in the New Testament. Chicago. 1905.
- Moffatt, James: Love in the New Testament. London. 1929.
- Muirhead, L. A.: The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testaments. London. 1908.
- Norden, Eduard: Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte Religiöser Rede. Leipzig. 1923.
- Ramsay, W. M.: The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament. New York. 1915.
- Sellin, Ernst: Introduction to the Old Testament. Trans. by W. Montgomery. London. 1923.
- Stevens, G. B.: The Theology of the New Testament. Edinburgh. 1918.

- Streeter, B. H.: *The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins. London. 1924.
- Swete, H. B.: The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London. 1909.
- Taylor, Vincent: The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London. 1933.
- Titius, Arthur: *Die Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart. Drei Teile. Freiburg. 1895-1900.
- Toy, C. H.: Quotations in the New Testament. New York. 1884.
- Weiss, Johannes: Paul and Jesus. London. 1909.
- Weiss, Johannes:
Knopf, R.: *Das Urchristentum. Göttingen. 1917.
- Wrede, William: The Origin of the New Testament. London. 1909.
- Zenos, A. C.: The Plastic Age of the Gospel. New York. 1927.

2. - Journals.

The Church Quarterly Review.

Vol. CIII (October 1926) Richmond, Wilfred: "The Gospel of Life." PP. 20 ff.

The Expository Times.

Vol. XLVIII. No. 4.
(January 1931) Creed, J. M.: "The Kingdom of God has Come." P. 184.

Theology.

Vol. XXX. (1936).

Murray, J. O. F.: "The Historical Value of 'The Discourses' in St. John." PP. 71 ff.

Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
und die Kunde der älteren Kirche.

Band XXVII (1928)

Peterson, E.: "Urchristentum und Mandäismus." PP. 55 ff.

Band XXVI (1927)

Büchsel, F.: "Mandäer und Johannesjünger." PP. 219 ff.

Band XXXII (1933)

Schaefer, O.: "Der Sinn der Rede Jesu von den vielen Wohnungen in seines Vaters Hause, usw." PP. 210 ff.